

SENATE—Monday, October 2, 1989

(Legislative day of Monday, September 18, 1989)

The Senate met at 2 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Blessed is the Nation whose God is the Lord.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights * * * to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, receiving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Eternal God, Creator, giver of life and breath and all things, we thank Thee for the unprecedented freedom which is our legacy. We honor our Founding Fathers whose profound understanding of human rights envisioned a political system which has endured for 200 years and today is a model which is the hope of millions who have lived under oppressive godless governments. Help us Lord, not to take this gift of freedom for granted, nor to forget the Biblical roots from which it came. Grant us wisdom to appreciate the inevitability of repression when materialism is policy and spiritual reality is denied. Awaken us to the peril of liberty when the insidious disease of secularism prevails. While we abhor a system which repudiates human rights, save us from the illusion that such rights can be preserved apart from faith in God and a commitment to those values derived from such faith.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized under the standing order.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, following the time for the two leaders, there will be a period for morning business until 2:30 p.m. today. At that time the Senate will proceed into Executive Session to consider the nomination of Joseph Zappala to be Ambassador to Spain, with debate only on the nomination today. There will be no rollcall votes today.

AMERICA'S RESPONSE TO CHANGES IN POLAND

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on September 12, a historic event occurred. A largely non-Communist government formally assumed power in Poland. This extraordinary event symbolizes the dramatic change underway in much of Eastern Europe, change that clearly reveals the failure of communism, change which offers an unprecedented, an indeed historic opportunity for democracy, and the West.

Days after the change of government in Poland, I spoke at length about the American response, I hoped would be forthcoming. I expressed my disappointment regarding the administration's failure to play an active leadership role in shaping a comprehensive Western policy toward Poland.

I noted that the President's proposal for Poland, aiming to change a Communist-controlled country, was wholly inadequate to assist the Solidarity-led government in successfully implementing economic and political reform.

I outlined the need for a more significant and comprehensive approach, an approach that includes a greater commitment to initiatives to foster private investment and enterprise in Poland, to expand trade opportunities between our two countries, and to reduce Poland's external debt. I called upon the administration to exert American influence among our allies and within international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank to speed efforts to alleviate Poland's crushing debt burden.

I encouraged the President to respond swiftly and creatively to the enormous opportunity before us, and I pledged to work with him toward that end.

The events that have since occurred have been encouraging, but I believe that the administration has yet to fully comprehend and seize this historic opportunity to promote political and economic freedom in Poland.

I am pleased that the President clearly has stated his intention that the United States be in the forefront of the international effort to assist Poland.

The President's call for the IMF and World Bank to work with Poland to rapidly develop a bold plan for economic recovery is a positive step which I hope will be followed by sustained administration attention and encouragement.

Most significant is the President's stated recognition that the United States must do more to assist the new Polish Government, a direct and candid acknowledgment of the inadequacy of the administration's initial response.

It is my hope that the administration will not, as some officials have implied, rely solely upon participation in the efforts of the IMF and the World Bank. I strongly support active participation in these institutions which provide loans linked to strike financial criteria. But I believe that the United States also can pursue a more imaginative policy capitalizing on American strengths and targeted toward Poland's specific and immediate needs. Fundamentally, it appears that the administration remains hesitant to move forward until Poland's economic reforms already are fully in place. In light of our great stake in the success of the new Polish Government, I believe this response is excessively timid.

Last week, I met with the Polish Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister, a leading architect of Poland's economic reform program. He described in detail the plan to cut government subsidies, privatize industry, stabilize the currency, encourage private enterprise and take other steps to move Poland toward a free market system. He expressed Poland's hope that the West would help provide the short-term assistance necessary to restore confidence and enable the new government to move ahead.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Solidarity-led government is firmly committed to transforming Poland's economic system. The only question is whether the West will make it possible for this transformation to succeed.

The European Economic Community appears to recognize the critical and immediate need for a concrete Western commitment to ensuring Poland's success.

We in Congress have made it clear that we want the United States to make a similarly dramatic commitment to helping the Polish people achieve full economic and political freedom. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has proposed an extensive package of financial, technical, and medical assistance in conjunction with trade and investment benefits. The House Foreign Affairs Committee is drafting its own comprehensive package to assist Poland's economic reform process.

Congress will do its best to ensure that the United States does, in fact, play a leading role in encouraging the success of Poland's brave experiment. Clearly our effort will be most effective if it is supported by the administration. I hope the administration will join us in an effort to provide a practical and creative package of assistance to Poland.

I call upon the administration to abandon its timidity and to take advantage of this historic opportunity to provide the kind of help that is necessary for democracy and open government to succeed in Poland.

Mr. President, since the close of the Second World War, the United States has spent not billions, not hundreds of billions, but trillions of dollars to provide military equipment to use if needed to defeat communism by force of arms. In Poland, we see the defeat of communism not by force of arms but as a result of its own internal failure. Communism is a failure.

People the world over want freedom and economic opportunity. Communism has failed to provide either. And in Poland, the peaceful transformation of a government from a Communist to a non-Communist system, the transformation of an economy from a state-run to an open economic system ought to be hailed by the United States. We ought to provide assistance to help democracy succeed peacefully with the same energy, vision, and enthusiasm that we would be demonstrating if called upon to help communism fail by military means.

So I encourage the President, having already acknowledged the inadequacy of his initial proposal, to now join with us to come forward with bold, productive, and meaningful steps to provide the assistance necessary to help democracy succeed.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time and I reserve the time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remainder of the majority leader time is reserved and the time of the Republican leader is also reserved.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended to 2:45 p.m. today and that the Senate then proceed into executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader extend my time for my remarks to 15 or 20 minutes. I will try to limit it as much as I can. I want to make one coherent statement about Hugo.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOUTH CAROLINA EXTENDS GRATITUDE FOR ASSISTANCE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, permit me to report to the Senate on my firsthand observations of a South Carolina struggling courageously to get back on its feet. Saturday and Sunday, I met with literally dozens of people whose homes were completely wiped out by Hurricane Hugo. They and tens of thousands like them have absorbed a tremendous shock, to their property and to their spirit. But they are determined to rebound and rebuild.

On that score, Mr. President, the Senate should be aware of the gratitude of the people of South Carolina for the tremendous outpouring of assistance from all across the country.

A few snapshots will give you some idea of the high morale and spirit of the recovery effort. Yesterday, Kelly's restaurant at Nags Head, NC, together with some half dozen restaurants in that community sent two big truckloads to Charleston loaded with some of the best-tasting food you have ever eaten, and we had the privilege of sharing it on Marion Square with hundreds of volunteer workers who had come from all corners of the United States. Words are inadequate to express our gratitude to those volunteers for all they have done and continue to do.

I will never forget the Cumberland County law enforcement group from North Carolina; the Ocean City group; Virginia Beach sent down 35 garbage trucks, plus a dozen or so firemen; South Bend, IN, sent volunteers from the Notre Dame section; Houston, TX; Stuttgart, AR; and Pompano Beach, FL, sent an entire public works team

along with equipment; Fort Lauderdale sent similar teams; Green County, outside of Atlanta, GA, has contributed similarly.

There were volunteers from Laconia, New Hampshire; from Seattle, Washington; from Alaska; and even from Hong Kong. The man from Hong Kong told me he was an exporter and happened to be in town on business, so he decided to stay and help with the cleanup.

I couldn't help thinking of all the bills aimed at encouraging volunteerism. Believe me, we already have it in this country, a tremendous sense of wanting to pitch in and lend a helping hand. A decade ago, we heard a President talk about America's malaise. Well, I say "Hold the malaise." You don't have to worry about the spirit of this country. It is strong and thriving. Some 200 policemen have come to Charleston from around the State. The town of Awendaw lost eight cars, so North Augusta and Aiken sent patrol cars; Greenville sent help too.

Yesterday afternoon, the city of Toms River, NJ, adopted the town of McClellanville, which had been totally wiped out. Yesterday afternoon 38 18-wheelers arrived, full of equipment, led by a police escort and three fire engines. All kinds of equipment just moved right in from Toms River, NJ.

The Southeastern Lumbermen's Association in Atlanta called me this morning and now we are coordinating delivery of lumber free of charge to help in the reconstruction. There is a mill in Prosperity that sent 3,700 pair of work clothes, and so forth.

The telephone company, particularly Mr. Byrd in Columbia, and Joe Addison, have been outstanding. We have gotten what we needed in communications.

The South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. has been outstanding. They have been working nonstop. They brought in crews from Alabama and Mississippi; the Salvation Army, the Red Cross, the National Guard. You cannot say enough for those folks who have been working with such dedication, virtually around the clock, for 11 days now. And a very special word of praise and thanks to the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers, the Army and Marines; they have been Johnny on the spot, performing with urgency and professionalism from day one of this crisis. The morning after Hugo hit, the Coast Guard had ships out at first light to look for survivors.

I called up to ask for assistance from our friends who played key roles in the aftermath of Hurricane Camille. I knew Bill Simpson as an administrative assistant to former Senator John Stennis. I said, "Bill, reassemble that Camille working group because they could help us coordinate." And immediately I saw them Friday night out at

the command center; eight of them paid their own way to South Carolina. They had ridden herd on the bureaucracy and paperwork when Camille hit down in the gulf. With their experience, they are in Charleston coordinating and directing our people in law enforcement. Everyone was tickled to death to get their expertise.

Corporate America, Mr. President, has responded in a most impressive way. Metropolitan Life; Philip Morris; Westvaco; Monsanto; all have made generous cash contributions.

The Taubman Co. up in Detroit sent down a young woman named Joyce Storm to oversee repair of the Omni Hotel in Charleston. She is now playing a major role in the citywide relief effort. I noted last week on the floor how Sam Walton had sent in 17 tractor-trailers from Walmart, and others were coming in. Well, it was a phone call from Joyce Storm that set all that in motion. She is working around the clock with volunteers, and becoming a local hero in the Charleston area.

Sunday morning I thanked one fellow working on a forklift which he was wheeling and dealing like an old pro. I said, "Thank God we have an expert." He said, "I have never been on one of these until yesterday, but I have been working it all day yesterday, all night, and all day today." I mean, he knew how to operate it.

So, Mr. President, this is the spirit of voluntarism and professionalism and tireless dedication that is carrying the day in South Carolina right now.

I could extend this at length, and I regret all the names I might have accidentally left out. I want to emphasize, after talking with Mayor Riley, Joyce Storm and the coordinating officials from every angle, that what we need, Mr. President, more than anything else is the expertise and manpower to handle the tons of supplies that are coming in from all over the country.

I started Monday morning a week ago urging Gen. Colin Powell to mobilize the Army's expertise. But, as I related on the floor last week, the FEMA crowd stopped us, roadblocked us; just stonewalled the whole thing. It was not until Friday that we got FEMA set up in the municipal auditorium. We need more. And the reason we need more is not for a lack of volunteers. We have people working now trying to get back to their families and their homes and their jobs. We need, especially in the rural areas, the face and presence of authority.

If we could have more troops from the supply brigades down in Fort Stewart, they would be a tremendous help. They could help us coordinate. When you send 38 18-wheelers into a little town like McClellanville, there is no place to unload and no way to deal with it. A supply brigade could work wonders in the town of McClellanville. Another team could go to Oranville.

After all, there are 24 counties affected in South Carolina. In each area they could use this expertise in coordination. We need most of all, with everything coming in, to ensure that is does not spoil, but is put to proper use and expeditiously delivered, because we have over 40,000 homeless, we have between 250,000 and 300,000 without electricity at this very moment. We need to be getting supplies to the people they are intended for and who critically need them.

At the same time, we need to clear the debris. I noticed in the morning paper how nearly 80 truckloads of debris were collected in a single quarter-mile stretch of road in Charleston. They have had a devil of a time just trying to clear out downed trees in all the small towns and particularly in the metropolitan areas of North Charleston, Charleston, Summerville, and so on. Meaning, of course, the electric and gas company is having great difficulty getting to their own downed lines. If we had the crews to come in with the equipment, the manpower to clear the debris and just systematically go about it, it would take them a good 10 days, going day and night at very least. Otherwise it will be this time next year, and I am not being facetious or talking lightly, it will be next year before we can get the job done.

Of course we also need homes for the homeless. Thousands and thousands of people have been put up in what is left of the schools, what is left of the churches. We have trailer-houses in reserve for this situation. There are thousands of them in Atlanta, in Texas and elsewhere. We need to start moving these trailers to rural areas where there is nothing being done. We need to get these folks in the trailers so their families can stay put and they can go to work, so we can begin to open up the schools again, because they have been closed, the schools and colleges, over this entire 11-day period.

I ran into this bottleneck of State officials worrying that they might be responsible for reimbursing the Feds for up to 25 percent of particular disaster-relief efforts. The choke point and bottleneck with FEMA and the State authorities in Columbia is they are all worried about the State running up a bill. I want to read section 502 of the Federal Emergency Assistance Act that we enacted last year, Public Law 100-707.

SEC. 502. FEDERAL EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.

(a) SPECIFIED.—In any emergency, the President may—

"(1) direct any Federal agency, with or without reimbursement, to utilize its authorities and the resources granted to it under Federal law (including personnel, equipment, supplies, facilities, and managerial, technical and advisory services) in support of State and local emergency assistance efforts to save lives, protect property and

public health and safety, and lessen or avert the threat of a catastrophe;

"(2) coordinate all disaster relief assistance (including voluntary assistance) provided by Federal agencies, private organizations, and State and local governments;

"(3) provide technical and advisory assistance to affected State and local governments for—

"(A) the performance of essential community services;

"(B) issuance of warnings of risks or hazards;

"(C) public health and safety information, including dissemination of such information;

"(D) provision of health and safety measures; and

"(E) management, control, and reduction of immediate threats to public health and safety;

"(4) provide emergency assistance through Federal agencies;

"(5) remove debris in accordance with the terms and conditions of section 407;

"(6) provide temporary housing assistance in accordance with section 408; and

"(7) assist State and local governments in the distribution of medicine, food, and other consumable supplies, and emergency assistance.

"(b) GENERAL.—Wherever the Federal assistance provided, under subsection (a) with respect to an emergency is inadequate, the President may also provide assistance with respect to efforts to save lives, protect property and public health and safety, and lessen or avert the threat of a catastrophe.

So, we have clear authority in the law itself. There is some question with respect to the grants that may go out as emergency disaster financial aid, that the State may have to pay up to 25 percent of it. But when we look at the total cost, some \$4 or \$5 billion, and that includes the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, as well as the Carolinas, I cannot imagine 25 percent of that, a billion, coming out of South Carolina, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We simply do not have it. We do not have it and it was not intended that we have it. It was intended only that we be vigilant, prudent, and not wasteful.

Mayor Riley and officials in Columbia are working hard to avoid waste. Their priority is to get people back to normal, back to work so they can fend for themselves. They are working around the clock. I have never seen anything like it.

The statute is clear. The authority is there. It should not be a roadblock, but a "go" signal. I think we can move if we can get this FEMA crowd moving.

I intervened this past weekend with Susan Engeleiter of the Small Business Administration, after we had passed our bill on the floor, Friday afternoon, with \$1,050,000,000. I said: "Can you light a fire under the Small Business Administration's disaster-response group?"

She said: "Yes, I cannot only help, I can open up those offices in South

Carolina, as many as you need, Senator."

I said: "Well, can't you take on that FEMA crowd and let us expedite it?" I would make a wager on the floor of the U.S. Senate there has not been \$1 delivered to anybody in South Carolina as of this minute. This is 11 days after the disaster. They have been buzzing around and bumping into each other but they are telling everybody in lines to fill out forms, come back October 7, and all this nonsense.

We need coordination. And I have called again on the Small Business Administration, because we do not yet have those offices.

Mr. President, I have mentioned a number of organizations that have responded with great skill and dedication to this crisis. Certainly, the U.S. National Weather Service must be near the top of anyone's list. They have performed magnificently before, during, and after Hugo. It was the Weather Service's accurate and timely forecasts that saved so many lives and allowed us to avoid even worse destruction. My hat is off to this superb outfit. It consistently does the government proud.

I also need to thank the many Senators and the volunteers they have mobilized. I want to thank those Senatorial staffs sending people to South Carolina to help with food stamp distribution and in other capacities. Many drove all night from New Jersey and elsewhere. I want to particularly thank Senator LAUTENBERG, whose staff rented a van and drove donated supplies to Williamsburg County; Senator ROBB, whose staff collected and delivered a huge collection of supplies; also Senator CONRAD, Senator SIMON, Senator DODD, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MITCHELL, Senator BENTSEN, Senator McCAIN, Senator FORD, Senator HEINZ, Senator FOWLER, Senator WIRTH, and Senator SARBANES. And the Capitol Policeman outside Russell Building came in a little while ago—I know he does not want any publicity but his name is Jack Ballard—with a financial contribution of his own. I am touched and grateful.

People are great in this country. There has been a tremendous sense of urgency and human concern. Of course, this is in stark contrast to the stonewalling up here from FEMA. Yes, they have declared 24 counties as disaster areas, but they do not have but 10 offices open for all of South Carolina, if they have indeed opened the additional 5. This is 11 days after the disaster. They have not yet awarded a financial grant that I know of.

The SBA has yet to process a loan. If they started today that would be fine. That would be the first that they have processed.

Bishop James of the AME Churches in South Carolina has organized an excellent grassroots relief effort. Mr.

President, I cannot praise too highly the stalwart leadership of our Charleston mayor, Joe Riley. He has just done a magnificent job, working around the clock. He had them all out there with T shirts reading "We are working together." Mr. President, the spirit is there. People are not despairing or fussing or complaining, but rather we are all in this together. We will build a stronger community out of the wreckage. And the best way is to not complain but go to work.

I must speak the blunt truth, however, that we at the Federal level have been embarrassed by the holdup we are suffering at FEMA and SBA. In that regard, I close with several paragraphs from this morning's edition of USA Today. I quote:

"I should say the next decade or two we should see more intense west Atlantic storms."

That prediction is little comfort to South Carolina residents who are still digging out—irate at the slow pace of aid.

Even the Federal Emergency Management Agency's public service announcements have opened it to ridicule.

Sunday, 10 days after Hugo wreaked \$5 billion in damage, FEMA aired a spot advising residents to have candles, batteries and full tanks of gas in case of a hurricane.

And 14 days after Hugo hit St. Croix, FEMA officials today set up two aid centers.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, the absence of a quorum having been suggested.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in executive session on the nomination of Joe Zappala, to be U.S. Ambassador to Spain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may speak as in executive session for not to exceed 5 minutes. The Senator is recognized.

JOSEPH ZAPPALA—IN THE BUSINESS OF AMERICA

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I rise in support of Joe Zappala for Ambassador to Spain. Joe Zappala is the son of immigrant parents who came to this country from Italy. He joined the Army when he was 17 years old.

He went into business in Florida and has become one of the State's leading businessmen. In the process, he has helped create tens of thousands of jobs and generated economic growth, but he has not just been involved in business and job creation, as important as that is. In fact, Calvin Coolidge once said the business of America is

business, and in that sense Joe has been in the business of America. But he has also been very active in efforts related to drug awareness and education and rehabilitation. He has been involved on behalf of retarded children. He has been heavily involved in community activities.

I know, Mr. President, that debate will occur as to whether Joe Zappala is qualified to be U.S. Ambassador because he does not have experience in the State Department. It seems to me that that is a relevant debate. I think experience in the State Department and knowledge of the foreign policy mechanism of America is a legitimate issue to raise. But I think also knowledge of America is a legitimate issue to raise.

More than anything else, the Ambassador of the United States in Spain represents our country, and I cannot think of anyone who is a better representative of what America is all about than the President's nominee for Ambassador to Spain. I think while we should and obviously have raised questions about the nominee's knowledge of the State Department, I think we ought to also be debating this nominee and other nominees' knowledge of America.

I would have to say, Mr. President, that I have complaints from time to time about professionals within the State Department, not a complaint about their knowledge of the State Department, but a complaint about their knowledge of America. I think in this case, we have someone who is the epitome of what the American system is all about. I think he will be an excellent representative of our Nation.

I commend the President for nominating him. I am strongly in support of him. In Joe Zappala, we have someone who will be a representative of America, who understands our system, whose life is the embodiment of that system.

Quite frankly, Mr. President, I would rather have someone who understands our system, what we are all about, what we are trying to do, than have someone who knows all about the State Department but who has relatively little experience in the business of America.

So, as a result, I am a strong supporter of this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to vote for Joe Zappala for Ambassador to Spain.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, the suggestion having been made that a quorum is not present.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended by 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Morning business will be extended for 10 minutes. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Chair.

"DROP-DEAD" DAY

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, we face a drop-dead day 2 weeks from now, a drop-dead day with regard to this year's budget process, but there is still time, I believe, and still sufficient energy in this body to get us through the appropriations conferences, through the reconciliation bill, and through the reconciliation conference. There is still a narrow window of opportunity and I think a glimmer of hope that we can avoid an ultimate sequester under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law.

But if that is to occur, we are going to have to act now. It is absolutely imperative that we move with dispatch. I do not believe a single Member of this body wants across-the-board spending cuts. I am confident of that. But in the rush of business it is frequently very hard for us to focus very far down the road. Let me take a moment, if I may, to telescope events and to describe what I think we will be facing if the sequester action is allowed to fall on October 15.

The best estimates are that if we fail to complete reconciliation, we are going to face a \$16 billion sequester on October 16. That would constitute the following problems: One, a 5-percent across-the-board cut in nondefense programs that are not exempt from sequester. That is going to include almost all appropriated accounts for nondefense programs and some entitlement programs. It will cut some \$6 billion through the 1990 fiscal year. The 5-percent cut would apply to the portion of funds appropriated in each continuing resolution as well.

Second, a 4-percent across-the-board cut from defense programs would occur. This would apply to military personnel accounts as well as other defense accounts since the President has chosen not to exercise his option under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law and exempt military personnel.

Defense budget authority would be cut by \$4.4 billion below the 1989 budget authority level. As with the do-

mestic cuts, the defense cuts would apply equally to the portion of funds appropriated in each continuing resolution.

Mr. President, nobody wants the chaos, I do not believe, that will ensue if we do not act quickly. But I fear that our sense of urgency is somehow diminished by the fallacious presumption that we will simply roll back all of the negative effects, unwind the sequester, and make everything all right once again.

Well, I suppose it is possible to do that but let us not be under the illusion that no one is going to notice the sequester; and that no one is going to experience discomfort or disruption.

The fact is that some programs, those that expired on October 1, are already feeling some negative affects.

Guaranteed student loans fit into that category, and both lenders and recipients, the students themselves, are already feeling some of the pain. GSL lenders are receiving reduced interest and new students are paying higher origination fees on their loans. Those things are going on right now.

Some disaster assistance payments under the Farm Relief Program are also being cut.

Further, Mr. President, should we miss our October 15 deadline, Medicare providers are going to be receiving about 2 percent less in their payments, and some Medicare beneficiaries will have their reimbursement checks reduced by about 2 percent.

If we trigger sequester, all of that is going to take place no matter how quickly we undo the damage.

And the most frustrating part of this entire logjam—as I said here a week ago when we were first beginning to see the spectre of sequester darkening the horizon—the most frustrating part of this stall in the process is that it simply does not have to be this way.

Once again, Mr. President, the various authorizing committees in the Senate are complying with their deficit reduction instructions. The appropriations committees are reporting bills that are within the targets established by the budget resolution—a budget resolution, I might add, that was agreed to very early this year by a bipartisan team from the administration and the Congress.

In short, the dominoes were falling neatly and in order until we came to the bridge washed out by the capital gains debate.

Mr. President, if we do indeed founder on the capital gains issue, if we do indeed cause the country the unnecessary confusion of sequester, the administration will bear the great burden of that failure of responsibility.

The sad fact is that the budget reconciliation bill has become the vehicle for virtually everything but deficit reduction. The privileges written into

the reconciliation process are being used to undercut the objectives toward which reconciliation was supposed to be directed.

When the administration insisted on using reconciliation to push their capital gains agenda, they flung open the flood gates and all the extraneous issues rolled in.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have produced a 40-page document that lays out the various extraneous provisions in the budget reconciliation bill. The bulk of that list relates to the House where the Byrd rule does not apply. And we, in this body, have done a better job of sticking to what is in fact at issue in reconciliation, the budget and this country's fiscal well being.

But Mr. President, those are precisely the issues that have been ignored as we fix our attention almost exclusively on the battle between capital gains and individual retirement accounts. And as that battle takes center stage, other issues irrelevant to deficit reduction get fought out on the periphery.

That is not how it was meant to be. That is not how it should be.

Mr. President, we still have the opportunity to get our eyes back on the prize, even if it's only for long enough to reach the modest deficit reduction goals we set for ourselves this year.

I want to urge all my colleagues who are involved in the reconciliation process to move just as quickly as possible. I want to congratulate the chairman and members of the authorizing committees in this body, who have worked long and hard to meet their reconciliation instructions and to report them on time.

I went to congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the chairmen of the various appropriations subcommittees, and the members of the appropriations subcommittees who have worked long and hard to reach the modest deficit reduction goals that were set in conjunction with a solemn agreement with the administration earlier this year.

If we can complete action on the floor by the close of this Friday, we still have a chance to go to conference with this bill next week and meet our targets, and meet our responsibilities. It simply is not in this Nation's best interests to let the tail of capital gains, President Bush's campaign promise of last year, continue to wag the dog, to bog this body down and to keep it from meeting its responsibilities, doing its duty, and avoiding sequester.

I yield the floor.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, today marks the 1,661st day that Terry Anderson has been held in captivity in Beirut.

In October of last year, a videotape was released by Terry Anderson's captors. I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 1, 1988]

HOSTAGE, ON VIDEOTAPE, FAULTS U.S.
EFFORTS TOWARD RELEASE

(By Nora Boustany)

BEIRUT, October 31.—American hostage Terry Anderson appeared in a videotape released today by his Shiite Moslem captors and said the U.S. government may have blocked agreements to release him. He added that the plight of the hostages has received little attention in the presidential campaign.

Anderson urged President Reagan and his successor to cooperate with "those who are trying to find a way out of this terrible impasse." He said that he had heard the "warming story" of U.S.-Soviet cooperation to free three trapped whales and called for comparable efforts toward gaining the release of the hostages.

The Associated Press journalist, who has been held more than 3½ years, longer than any other U.S. hostage, made his plea in a 2½-minute videotape distributed by the Iran-backed Islamic Jihad organization to two international news agencies this morning.

[In Los Angeles, Reagan denied that the United States had blocked any deal to free the American hostages and he accused the "barbarian" kidnapers of forcing Anderson to read a false statement. "I don't think that was Terry speaking," Reagan told reporters. "I think he had a script that was given to him. When I was given a script, I always read the lines."]

On the tape, Anderson, who marked his 41st birthday last week, spoke assertively, appeared clean-shaven and trim and assured his family, friends and the American people that he was being "well treated." But he conceded that he found it hard to keep his spirits up.

Release of the tape came amid a flurry of Islamic Jihad statements accompanied by photos of Anderson—five in the past 10 days—in what observers here saw as a sign that his captors are eager to free him soon.

Shiite Moslem security sources said they would not be surprised if some of the nine American hostages were released in the coming week, before the American presidential election. Western diplomats watching hostage developments here said, however, that they had seen no indications that a release was imminent.

"I gather there has been very little discussion of our problem in the U.S. presidential campaign, and that's disappointing, as is President Reagan's complete failure to find a solution," Anderson said on the tape.

"All that is necessary is that Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush, if he is elected, use their influence in a positive way, not a negative one, with those who are trying to find a way out of this terrible impasse," he said, reading from a prepared statement.

Referring to the United States' declared principle of not negotiating with kidnapers, Anderson said, "I am not asking Reagan to deal with terrorists, although Mr. Bush did so in the Iran-contra affair and the [1985] TWA hijacking."

Anderson also charged that the U.S. government obstructed agreements that could have led to his release.

"I was very close to being released several times over the past two years but each time it seems that the U.S. government uses its influence to stop any agreement from being made," he said.

Anderson said that "whichever candidate wins this election, remember: an unyielding refusal to deal with this matter is not going to make it go away, it's not going to free us."

"I heard on the radio of the generous and ambitious effort to free three trapped whales a few days ago and of the president's thanks to the Soviet Union for its help," he said. "It is a warming story. That kind of co-operation and spirit is absolutely necessary to put this situation to an end."

Anderson opened the tape, the third showing him that has been released by Islamic Jihad since his capture in March 1985, by saying: "My name is Terry Anderson and this is the 30th of October. Once again I'm given the chance to speak to my family and to my friends and to the American people."

"First to my family, I love you and I miss you very much. I know of your continued strong efforts for me," he said. He also expressed gratitude to friends, fellow journalists and other people who have worked on his behalf.

He asked various relatives, including "Dad," to "kiss my daughters for me," an indication that he is not aware his father died in 1986.

A TURNING POINT FOR ANGOLA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while most of the world, media, and political attention in recent months have focused on the events in China, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe, and equally momentous set of events has occurred in southern Africa.

During no other time in the past 14 years have the prospects for peace, freedom, and the exchange of ideas shown more progress in the little heard of but vitally important country of Angola. If this potential is going to be carried to its final conclusion, the United States must turn our bipartisan policy of support for national reconciliation and support for free and fair elections into active engagement in the region.

How many of us imagined 1 year ago South Africa, Cuba, and Angola would sign an agreement to achieve the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. Today, Cuban troops are leaving Angola and the process leading to free elections in Namibia is scheduled for November.

How many who have followed events in Angola believed a handshake between Dr. Jones Savimbi, president of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA], and Angolan President Eduardo Jose dos Santos was possible; and again we recorded this historic occurrence in June. At a summit meeting in Gbadolite, Zaire, witnessed by 18 African heads of state, the two parties agreed

to begin negotiations aimed at ending the war and building a peaceful nation.

Since the initial meeting in Zaire, negotiations have broken down. The MPLA has publicly revoked its commitment to the Gbadolite declarations of a cease-fire, national reconciliation and direct negotiations. Moreover, the Marxist MPLA regime continues to perpetuate war rather than facilitate peace. They have exhibited classic gunboat diplomacy by attempting to achieve with talks what they failed to do in 14 years of war. The positions they have put forward are political suicide for UNITA. At the same time they are trying to press UNITA militarily. The MPLA must understand that if it continues to pursue a military option, rather than reconciliation with UNITA, then the United States will not hesitate to apply increased pressure to reach the goals of democracy and free and fair elections.

Communism, like a disease, must be completely obliterated. Left to linger, it can regenerate itself and destroy fragile elements of change and progress. Continued attention and pressure from the United States and other African nations can get the talks back on track so a lasting peace and a truly free and prosperous Angola can be a reality.

The time for action is critical. Conditions in Angola cannot wait. What good is a policy if there is no action? How can we influence positive action for change without becoming engaged in the process? Where is our passion when victory is so close and within our grasp? Whether resumed negotiations can bring about a lasting peaceful settlement only time will tell. However, it is clear a continued United States policy of pressing for national reconciliation and free and fair elections in Angola remains the best policy approach.

Finally, all interested parties must realize there are new winds blowing over southern Africa, and they are the winds of peaceful change and a movement to democracy. Africa is exhausted from war, drought, and famine. The sense that peace is a necessary ingredient for bringing a better life to all Africans continues to grow.

The United States has responsibilities in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and other places too numerous to name. But we have a special obligation in Africa the poorest continent. A steady policy of support for freedom and progress through economic growth and opportunity and the exchange of ideas are the most important ingredients for peaceful change. In Angola, we are close, closer to that goal than ever before. A bipartisan foreign policy of support for national reconciliation, independence, and free elections has brought us this

far. We must continue to engage this policy and restore to those who have fought for so long with so little, against such odds, but with hope and determination the promises of peace, freedom, and democracy in Angola.

CORRECTIONS TO REPORT ON NOAA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in the printing of the report 101-144 accompanying H.R. 2991, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriations bill, 1990, some changes approved at the full committee markup for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration were not reflected. Inasmuch as these changes affect several programs in NOAA's "Operations, Research and Facilities" appropriation, and have led to a little confusion, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, the corrected pages 22 through 27.

There being no objection, the corrections were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

Appropriations, 1989	\$1,240,052,000
Budget estimate, 1990	998,448,000
House allowance	966,932,000
Committee recommendation	1,216,830,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,216,830,000, a decrease of \$23,222,000 from 1989 appropriations to date. The amount recommended is \$218,382,000 over the budget request and is \$249,898,000 over the House allowance.

The Committee recommendation compared to the 1989 level and the budget request is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]		
	1989 enacted	1990 recommended
Additions to budget request: National Ocean Service: Vertical control network South Carolina multipurpose mapping project Great Lakes mapping project Multipurpose cadastre survey Circulatory Program Ocean assessment activities (Long Island Sound—\$1,000,000) California data buoys Coastal zone management: 306 and 306(a) State grants Coastal zone management: 309 grants Estuarine sanctuary program Marine sanctuary management Coastal zone management program management Wetlands demonstration project Ocean services National Marine Fisheries Service: Resource surveys and technology Protected species research Habitat research Fisheries statistics Analysis of ecosystems	200 377 100 1,836 400 6,500 151 33,000 942 1,600 504 500 900 2,400 2,650 1,200 5,133 2,919 917	577 100 1,836 200 3,500 151 34,000 400 2,300 1,000 1,500 900 500 2,650 1,200 5,133 2,919 917

[In thousands of dollars]

	1989 enacted	1990 recommended
Aquaculture (Newport, OR—\$350,000; Stuttgart, AR—\$2,050,000) Chesapeake Bay studies SEAMAP MARFIN PACFIN West coast groundfish research Right whale research Marine mammal research Gear entanglement research Habitat evaluation research Subarctic fisheries research Bering Sea pollock research Hawaii stock management plan Complete Lake Mead limnological research Yukon River chinook study Japanese salmon interceptions Alaska salmon hatcheries Pacific salmon research Atlantic salmon research Alaska whale rescue reimbursement Antarctic research Regional fisheries councils Columbia River/Mitchell Act hatcheries Manage Georges Bank fisheries Tiburon lab Habitat conservation Oregon harbor seals and sea lions Oyster disease research Shellfish water standards research Endangered species recovery plans Fisheries trade promotion activities Interjurisdictional fisheries grants to States Anadromous fisheries grants Striped bass research Interstate fisheries commissions Product, quality, and safety research Fish oil research Asian aquaculture exchanges St. Paul trust fund St. George trust fund Mahi Mahi technology research Seafood inspection program Marine Mammal Protection Act implementation Driftnet Act implementation Enforcement and surveillance Woods Hole Fisheries Lab bulkhead and dock Ocean and atmospheric research: Regional climate centers (\$300,000 each for Illinois, New York-New England, Nebraska, Nevada, South Carolina, and Louisiana) National climate program office State weather modification grants Sea grant National Coastal R&D Institute NOAA Undersea Research Program (NURP) Key Largo research facility Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory (GLERL) VENTS/sea floor spreading research (Newport, OR) Fisheries-oceanography coordinated investigations (FOCI) PROFS Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute (Construction) University of New Hampshire marine research National Weather Service: Staffing of weather service forecast offices Southern regional headquarters Pacific and Alaska regional headquarters Data buoy activities Fire weather Agriculture and fruit frost warnings Oregon and Washington Mountain weather services Susquehanna River flood warning system operations Colorado River Basin flood warning system operations Meteorological/hydrological research MARD Advanced weather interactive processing system (AWIPS)	4,344 1,600 942 3,000 1,000 847 235 1,506 706 471 753 750 400 400 235 141 3,766 4,708 250 170 1,300 3,766 9,300 471 94 1,883 36 500 500 235 1,388 3,500 2,354 471 330 4,400 942 282 1,700 1,200 188 330 7,500 3,000 1,500 2,000 1,500 250 2,213 39,000 1,177 14,285 377 1,600 1,695 942 1,883 2,000 2,000 787 852 383 1,105 282 1,335 200 700 300 320 1,000 8,500	4,775 1,600 942 4,000 1,000 847 235 1,750 706 471 750 400 235 3,766 4,708 500 170 1,300 3,766 9,300 471 94 1,883 36 1,000 235 1,388 3,500 2,354 471 330 4,400 942 282 1,700 1,200 330 7,500 3,000 1,500 2,000 1,600 2,000 942 1,883 2,000 2,000 787 852 383 1,105 282 1,335 200 700 300 320 1,000 8,500

[In thousands of dollars]

	1989 enacted	1990 recommended
Restore base weather service funding to maintain weather stations National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service: NOAA port EROS data center Program support: Marine services Increased base adjustments 1989 supplemental Total additions Reductions from budget request: Polar satellite spacecraft and launching (slippage) Landsat commercialization Landsat 4 and 5 operations Reduced adjustments to base funding ANCS II Coastal ocean initiative Climate and global change NEXRAD Administration, services, and facilities Aircraft services Total reductions Recap: Budget request Additions to budget request Reductions from budget request Transfer from CEIF Transfer from S/K fund Deobligations Appropriation	29,073 2,000 3,000 6,275 28,400 249,064 -33,619 -13,700 6,400 -12,378 -1,660 -4,261 -6,000 -12,500 -3,651 -575 -84,083 1,133,171 249,064 -84,083 -6,500 -45,600 -6,000 1,240,052	29,073 2,000 3,000 7,275 28,400 251,559 -6,349 -2,000 -9,500 -1,660 -4,261 -2,000 -14,867 -3,651 -575 -38,977 1,066,648 +251,559 -38,977 -4,500 -51,900 -6,000 1,216,830

The Committee provides \$18,005,000 of the administration's request to continue development of NOAA's program in climate and global change. The program will augment and integrate existing programs and should include global observations, monitoring, and data and information management relating to the study of changes in the Earth's climate system, fundamental research on critical oceanic and atmospheric processes, and climate prediction and diagnostics.

The Committee's recommendation includes increases totaling \$10,900,000 for upgrading the computers at the National Meteorological Center and the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, and an increase of \$8,139,000 for the coastal ocean initiative. With respect to the latter item, the Committee expects that \$350,000 will be allocated to the University of South Carolina School of Public Health and the Baruch Institute for research to effectively manage small, high-salinity estuaries, in collaboration with the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeastern Fisheries Laboratory in Charleston, SC.

The Committee intends that \$1,000,000 of the funds provided to NOAA for ocean assessment activities is for continuation of the work required to support the multiyear Long Island Sound study, which was designated as part of the EPA National Estuary Program in 1988. It is also the Committee's intention that work carried out with this funding will be done with the approval of the Long Island Sound Study Management Committee, of which NOAA is a member. In addition, \$2,500,000 has been provided for NOAA's damage assessment activities under the Clean Water Act.

In increasing the allocation for the South Carolina multipurpose mapping project by \$200,000 the Committee intends that one-half of the increase will be retained by the National Ocean Service for support of the expanded work in South Carolina.

The Committee has set aside \$900,000 in funds from this account to continue a joint Federal-State research and demonstration

project to develop a natural resources information system and to establish criteria and standards by which the public interest in privately owned natural resources can be determined. The Committee directs the National Ocean Service to contract with the State of South Carolina's Water Resources Commission to conduct this demonstration in the watershed of Edisto, and the upper reaches of the Combahee River. This pilot project will provide valuable information and methodology to enable the States and the Federal Government to continue to efficiently manage our natural resources. The Committee further expects that the State of South Carolina will finance an increasing percentage of the costs of the project over the last 2 years of this 5-year joint effort.

The additional \$500,000 for ocean services is for the NOAA Center for Ocean Analysis and Prediction to cover continuing operating expenses in Monterey, CA.

Within the \$2,650,000 restored for resource survey activities, the Committee expects NMFS to continue contracting with South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department for Resource Surveys.

The Committee notes its strong support for continued funding through the National Marine Fisheries Service of the Stuttgart, AR, Fish Farming Experimental Station operated by the U.S. Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service. The Stuttgart farm is one of the Nation's leading research institutions on fresh-water aquaculture and the largest facility in the country of this type. The Committee directs that \$75,000 of the funds received by Stuttgart for its operating budget be used to conduct research studies between Stuttgart and the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff related to aquaculture and catfish farming. The Committee also directs the National Marine Fisheries Service to continue its present cooperative relationship with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Of the \$4,000,000 provided for MARFIN, the Committee has provided \$1,000,000 for expanding the program to address fisheries issues in the South Atlantic. The South Atlantic expansion of MARFIN is intended as a coordinated research program involving the NMFS, the four South Atlantic States (North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida), sea grant and independent universities. This funding initiative would bring the scientific talent of the above groups to bear on important fisheries in the region. Initial priority should be placed on those for king and Spanish mackerel and red drum including expanded data collection and better catch statistics. Recreational catch statistics are especially critical.

Of the funds restored for marine mammal research, \$350,000 shall be provided to the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission to support scientific research and the cooperative agreement with NOAA, and not less than \$400,000 shall be available for monk seal research.

Within the \$3,500,000 restored for inter-jurisdictional fisheries grants to States, the Committee directs that \$200,000 be allocated for emergency disaster relief assistance for the oyster industry along the Texas gulf coast.

The Committee has provided \$11,600,000 for the NOAA Undersea Research Program, and directs that \$3,000,000 be provided to the Hawaii Undersea Research Laboratory [HURL].

The Committee has included grant funding of \$2,000,000 for a small research vessel and related equipment, laboratory equip-

ment, and research instruments for the marine research and education programs of the University of New Hampshire.

The Committee was pleased at the announcement by the Secretary of Commerce in March of this year that the Nation's weather stations would remain in service at current operating levels through fiscal year 1990. The Committee wishes to reiterate its support of the Nation's weather service stations and has included the full \$29,073,000 required to carry out the Secretary's announcement. In restoring the funds, the Committee expects the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration to continue operation of West Virginia's weather stations at current levels. The Committee also expects NOAA to maintain the agricultural weather, fire weather, and other weather and flash-flood warning programs as they affect West Virginia at the fiscal year 1989 levels and to continue to accelerate the implementation of the integrated flood observing and warning system [IFLOWS] in West Virginia and surrounding States. The Committee wishes to be kept fully informed of the remaining milestones needed to complete the West Virginia portions of the IFLOWS system.

In the interest of aviation safety, the Committee has included the necessary funding in the NOAA account to reopen the federally contracted weather observation stations at Stampede Pass, WA, Blue Canyon, OR, and Sexton Summit, OR, closed between December 30, 1988 and April 1, 1989, at the same level of service and hours of operation as on December 29, 1988. The Committee urges NOAA not to close or reduce the hours of operation of such stations until automated equipment is provided that will provide the same level of service as a full-time human weather observer.

The Committee recommendation reflects approval of the cyclical program reductions totaling \$119,699,000 proposed in the budget request for the polar orbiting and GOES satellite programs and NOAA port.

The Committee recommends \$44,400,000 for the Landsat system, of which \$34,900,000 is for the continued construction of Landsat 6 and \$9,500,000 is for the expenses associated with the continued operation of Landsats 4 and 5. The amount provided for the operational expenses of Landsats 4 and 5 is based on the continued availability and level of Landsat imagery during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1990. If Landsats 4 and 5 continue to operate for a longer period of time, then NOAA will need to make suitable financial arrangements.

The amount recommended provides \$3,500,000 for the further consolidation of NOAA's Washington offices in the Silver Spring, MD, Metro Building. This amount includes \$750,000 for payment to the General Services Administration for the funds advanced by the Federal buildings fund for furniture for NOAA's new offices. The Committee expects a like amount to be budgeted for 1991.

The Committee is aware of NOAA's apparent reluctance to release appropriated funds in fiscal year 1989 for the Hawaii stock management plan, the Asian aquaculture exchanges, and Mahi Mahi technology research, not contained in the President's budget that have been identified in the statement of managers accompanying conference reports for recent appropriations acts. The Committee has also noted the obvious lack of such reluctance for apportioning funds requested in the President's

budget. Therefore, the Committee directs NOAA to expedite the obligation of funds for the Hawaii stock management plan, the Asian aquaculture exchanges, and Mahi Mahi technology research, and in doing so, carry out the congressional intent of appropriations acts. Further, the Committee mandates that NOAA cease the apparent discrimination exhibited against congressionally funded and supported initiatives.

The Committee has included bill language to provide that administrative costs associated with the Saltonstall/Kennedy fund grant program be derived from receipts in the fund.

COAL INDUSTRY HEALTH BENEFIT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1989

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on Friday, I introduced, along with my distinguished senior colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, and the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania, Senator HENZ and Senator SPECTER, the Coal Industry Health Benefit Stabilization Act of 1989.

This legislation is needed to help address an emergency. It is needed to help ensure the financial condition of the health benefits program for retired coal miners. Simply put, what this bill does is authorize transfers of surplus funds from the 1950 United Mine Workers of America [UMWA] pension trust to the UMWA benefit trusts. The benefit trusts provide health benefits to 125,000 beneficiaries, with the majority of retirements from companies which are no longer in the coal business.

In recent years, due to such causes as rapidly escalating health care costs, the two UMWA health benefit funds have experienced serious financial difficulties. The 1950 fund has a \$54 million deficit and the other is expected to be in deficit within weeks. As a consequence, payments to doctors, hospitals, and pharmacies are overdue by as much as 60 days.

We face the possibility of a breakdown of the health care system for retired miners. In West Virginia alone, there are approximately 32,000 UMWA pensioners who rely on the UMWA funds for health care. The funds contribute many millions of dollars to the West Virginia economy, and sustain the efforts of many health care practitioners and organizations. If allowed to continue unchecked, the financial difficulties in the UMWA health funds could cripple health care delivery in West Virginia and in the coal counties of States like Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

In contrast with the health funds, the 1950 pension fund has a substantial surplus, according to independent actuaries who have reviewed the financial condition of the fund. The bill would authorize use of the surplus

pension funds to help repair the financial condition of the health funds. However, under the bill, the decision to transfer funds could only be made and the precise amount of surplus to be transferred would be determined through a joint decision of the UMWA and the Bituminous Coal Operators' Association [BCOA]. This is a critical point because it means that union representatives will have coequal participation and veto power.

The pension and health funds are supported financially by companies that have participated in the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement, which has been renegotiated periodically by the BCOA and the UMWA. The BCOA and UMWA have viewed the imminent health fund crisis with growing concern. After discussions between the BCOA and the UMWA, they asked me to introduce the present legislation, which they fully support. In order to help strengthen the financial basis of the funds, the legislation not only authorizes the transfers referred to before. It also provides statutory reinforcement for the contractual and other obligations of the companies regarding contributions to the retiree health funds. In this way, the security of each contributor is enhanced by the knowledge that the responsibilities of all contributors will be met.

Mr. President, many of our colleagues are aware that the funding of retiree health care throughout American industry is receiving increasing attention. It may be that in the next decade there will be a major, comprehensive revision of the way we approach the funding of retiree health care in this country. But the coal industry cannot wait for the long run. It faces an emergency today. That is why legislation specifically for the coal industry is required.

Furthermore, it should be understood that action to address the special needs of retirees in the coal industry is in keeping with the longstanding special relationship among the coal miners, coal operators, and the Federal Government. The UMWA pension and health funds were created as a result of discussions between President Truman's Secretary of the Interior and the UMWA in 1946, when the Federal Government was operating the country's bituminous coal mines. An early trustee of the funds was the late distinguished Republican leader, Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire.

The 1946 agreement establishing the funds required a survey of medical conditions in the coal fields and the retiree health program set to work responding to conditions the report found deplorable. Among other things, the program established hospitals and a rehabilitation program that combed the coal fields to identify the thou-

sands of miners who had been crippled, with broken backs and severed limbs. At rehabilitation centers, they received the best treatment that modern medicine could offer. They were fitted with artificial limbs and received extensive physical therapy and occupational and vocational training. This unique program provided renewed hope for many disabled coal miners who, until then, had no income and no expectation of ever again becoming productive members of society.

The program under the health fund also made great strides for improvement of overall medical care in coal mining communities. For example, the average age of a coal miner at death in 1947 was 10 years less than the national average for males. By 1946, it was 4 years more than the national average. The longevity of miners had increased by a remarkable 30 percent. Today, the UMWA health and pension funds pay many millions of dollars in benefits to over 125,000 beneficiaries in States from California to West Virginia.

Mr. President, we have come too far and the road has been too long, for us to turn our backs on this record of achievement. The successes for health care in the coal fields are an achievement of which all Americans can be proud. They provide a record of decency and of support for human dignity that is a model for the world. But for some years now, the structure that brought us these achievements has been eroding, and it is now in great jeopardy. We must act.

For over 100 years and more, coal miners have played a critical role in building this country from a small agricultural nation into a great industrial power. Our country was built on the backs of miners, who often paid with their health and their lives so the rest of us could enjoy the fruits of 20th century prosperity. Most Americans understand this and the importance of addressing the special needs of our coal communities.

Occasionally, however, I hear it said that because of rising health care costs or international competition, we must reverse course. But an effort to turn the clock back on our progress in industrial conditions is sadly misguided. Industrial strength can only rest on a foundation of mutual respect and mutual support. Continuous industrial chaos and recriminations are a recipe for industrial decline as well as for erosion of human dignity—a lesson most Americans learned long ago.

A decade of generally good coal industry labor relations has recently been disrupted by a bitter strike involving one company, bringing economic devastation to West Virginia and neighboring States. Adding to the difficulties for the health funds caused by inflationary trends, the shocking cutoff of health benefits and

contributions viewed as a tool of economic conflict has touched off a firestorm. Fear and frustration regarding the eroding condition of the retiree health care system have fanned the flames of this conflict. It is a conflagration that threatens to spread throughout the industry, engulfing employers and employees alike, threatening to destroy the well-being of thousands and the position of the U.S. coal industry in global markets.

It was, in part, to avoid this kind of industrial chaos that coal industry labor relations were established forty years ago on the rock of the UMWA pension and health trust funds. If that rock is allowed to crumble, the consequences will be felt far beyond the retired miners whose health benefits are in jeopardy. The support for the present legislation by the BCOA as well as the UMWA reflects the widespread recognition of these facts throughout the industry.

In helping to preserve the rights of retirees, this bill does not address the deficits in the UMWA health funds through Government spending. On the contrary, because of the operation of the tax laws, I expect this bill to have a positive impact on the budget. What the miners ask for is the authority to use money from their own pension fund to address the deficits in their health funds.

The long-term future of retiree health care in American industry, including the coal industry, will not be solved today or by this bill. To do that, we must address difficult long-term issues of health care costs, industrial policy, and employment. Therefore, securing the long-term future of retiree health care will require persistent effort over many years. It is an effort that must be a top priority on our national agenda. It is an effort in which I intend to be actively involved.

But we also have a job to do today, and that is to prevent the imminent collapse of the coal industry retiree health care system. We need to provide increased certainty that the health care needs of affected retired miners and their families will be met. We cannot forsake the people who have been the backbone of America's coal industry, especially those in their twilight years who have special medical needs. We must continue to ensure that the promise of good health care for retired miners is kept.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

COAL INDUSTRY HEALTH BENEFIT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1989

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of S. 1708, the Coal Industry Health Benefit Stabilization Act of 1989, which

has been introduced by my fellow Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROCKEFELLER. I believe this legislation is of critical importance, as it will help restore and stabilize the financial condition of the retired employee health benefit funds of the bituminous coal industry.

Two collectively bargained multiemployer trust funds currently provide medical benefits for approximately 130,000 retired coal workers. The 1950 benefit plan covers those employees who retired prior to 1976. This plan is currently in deficit by approximately \$54 million. The 1974 benefit plan covers those employees who retired after 1976 and, at least according to its original design, whose former employers are no longer in business. Although currently in balance, this plan is projected to fall into deficit by the end of the year.

To allow these plans to founder would, I believe, be a tragedy for the retirees involved, and a shortsighted error on our part. We all know how the absence of adequate or affordable medical insurance is a growing national problem. We read stories almost daily of the millions of Americans who are without medical coverage. And we know that because of gaping holes in our insurance system, the cost of providing care to those without medical coverage often falls upon the back of the American taxpayer.

We are too compassionate, and rightly so, as a nation and as individuals, to simply deny medical care to those among us who, often for reasons entirely beyond their control, lack the financial resources to provide adequate medical care for themselves. Therefore, we would be foolish to let pass any opportunity to shore up those private insurance systems which provide much needed medical coverage to our retired citizens.

Today, just such an opportunity confronts us. The two multiemployer health plans which provide medical care for more than 100,000 retired coal workers are facing a bleak future. The financial stability of these plans has been seriously weakened by a combination of rapidly rising health care costs, the addition of more and more beneficiaries, and a shrinking contribution base. As a result, one plan is already in deficit, while the other is rapidly approaching a deficit situation.

Today, we have an opportunity to ensure that these deficits do not undermine the long-term survival of the 1950 and the 1974 benefit plans. The solution offered in this legislation is a relatively simple one. First, the bill authorizes the transfer of surplus funds from the 1950 pension plan to the two financially troubled health benefit plans. Second, the bill prevents companies who were once participants in these multiemployer plans and who remain in business today from effec-

tively dumping responsibility for continued health care coverage on those firms who continue to contribute to these multiemployer plans.

The 1950 pension plan is a closed plan, covering only those individuals who retired before 1976. As such, its future liabilities and obligations can be reliably and precisely estimated. As a result of a past policy of rapid funding and conservative actuarial assumptions, the 1950 pension plan has accumulated a substantial surplus. With the assets of this pension plan safely invested in a dedicated bond portfolio, this surplus can be safely transferred without lessening, in any way, the ability of the plan to pay future pension benefits.

Without a transfer of funds from the 1950 pension plan to the two struggling benefit trusts, the assessments for the 1950 and 1974 health funds would have to be raised from a combined total of \$2.25 per hour worked by a covered employee to \$3.12 per hour—an increase of nearly 40 percent. I believe, however, an increase of that magnitude would impose such an onerous burden on the employers involved as to be counterproductive, in the long run, in terms of enhancing the financial stability of the health plans.

While authorizing a transfer of funds from the 1950 pension plan will help ease the immediate and pressing financial problems confronting the two medical benefit plans, an equally important second step taken in this bill is to require companies who had an obligation to contribute to one of the health plans on January 1, 1988, to continue making contributions as long as a national collective bargaining agreement remains in effect. The 1974 benefit plan was established for the purpose of providing health benefits for orphan retirees, those retired workers whose former employers have since ceased operating. It was not created to provide a way for companies who are still in business to transfer the health insurance costs of their retirees to other companies within the coal industry.

The provisions of this bill that effectively prohibit employees from dumping responsibility for health benefits for their retirees on the industrywide 1975 health plan are supported by both labor and management. This legislation has been crafted with the cooperation and support of those coal companies who have continued to contribute to the industry's multiemployer benefits plans, thereby conscientiously upholding commitments previously made to their retirees.

Finally, Mr. President, I would note that no costs are imposed on American taxpayers by this bill. To the contrary, to the extent that tax-deductible contributions might otherwise have to be significantly increased to put these

health benefit plans back on sound financial ground, a transfer of funds from the 1950 pension plan would actually prevent a loss in revenues to the Federal Government. While my support for this legislation is in no way motivated by its positive revenue effect, I believe it is important to note the absence of any negative revenue effect.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It is a timely bill, and I would hope that the Senate will act upon it quickly. I commend my colleague and friend from West Virginia for the work he has done in putting together this legislation. Let us now move forward to preserve and strengthen the coal industry's unique privately funded program for providing health care coverage to its retirees.

UNITED STATES-CUBA COOPERATION ON NARCOTICS IS IN OUR NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in mid-June when the Cuban Government arrested General Ochoa on charges of narcotics trafficking, I issued a statement recognizing Cuba's action. I also reiterated that during my meeting with President Castro last November we discussed the possibilities of cooperation between the United States Coast Guard and the Cuban Boarder Patrol on narcotics interdiction. Fidel Castro responded positively to this as he did to Congressman RANGEL during the visit which followed mine.

I am well aware that various interpretations are being given to the Cuban government's quick and decisive actions as shown by the execution of General Ochoa and other high ranking military and internal security officials. We must not ignore the fact that the Castro government has moved vigorously against Cuban officials involved in narcotics trafficking. Most importantly, Fidel Castro in early July stated the need for communication between the United States and Cuba to combat the common foe of narcotics.

We must not let this opportunity pass. If indeed we are waging a serious war against drugs, United States-Cuba cooperation should be an important component. As I stated during a Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearing on United States-Cuba narcotics issues, we should move forward on discussions with the Cubans on narcotics cooperation. This cooperation with the Coast Guard would serve the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the op ed piece written by respected journalist Tad Szulc which appeared in the New York Times during the August recess. Mr. Szulc, who recently wrote a critical biography of Fidel Castro, also

believes that we should be talking to the Cubans about narcotics cooperation. He states, "Common sense as well as cynical self-interest seem to dictate full-fledged talks with Cuba on the desperately urgent matter of drug trafficking."

I ask unanimous consent that the Szulc piece be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the piece was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1989]

JOIN WITH CASTRO TO FIGHT DRUGS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON.—For reasons that may be cynical and self-serving, Cuba's President Fidel Castro has formally invited the United States—for the first time—to join his regime in the "common battle" against drug smuggling. For reasons of American national interest, which likewise often requires self-serving cynicism, the Bush Administration would be well advised to at once take Mr. Castro at his word instead of responding with worn out legalisms and ideological foot-dragging.

That the Cuban leader has only now offered to cooperate with U.S. authorities in helping to stem the ever-rising flow of narcotics to this country across the Caribbean from South America is unquestionably the immediate result of the shocking discoveries that he says he made in April—that 14 of his top officials were part of the Colombian Medellin Cartel contraband ring.

In the most dramatic display of Castro power in 30 years, four of them, including the former commander in chief of Cuban troops in Angola, who was regarded as a national hero, were executed last month. Many others (among them, the Interior Minister) were arrested, and others were fired and disgraced in the still continuing purge.

Whether Mr. Castro, as many observers suspect, used the drug and corruption scandal to smash a parallel political conspiracy against his rule is a fascinating but separate subject. So is the reality that his economy is in such disastrous straits that he needs quick access to American trade and tourism.

What should concern the U.S. at this juncture is Havana's belated willingness to work with American law enforcement agencies in trying to control drug smuggling, in the light of fresh evidence that use of cocaine-derived crack at home is at record levels.

The Administration knows that the Cubans have the means, ranging from their MIG-23 jet fighters to their high-speed naval patrol boats, their electronic listening and radar installations and their Latin American intelligence network, to cripple the illegal traffic if they so desire. Cuba lies astride the main smuggling routes from Colombia to the eastern U.S. and smugglers' small aircraft found it safe and convenient to drop drug cargoes near the island for recovery by fast boats.

The Cuban route was vital because the U.S. has effectively closed off Bahamian air space. Transfer to boats is necessary since smugglers' planes are virtually precluded by U.S. air defenses from reaching the mainland.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 39 such drops were spotted in the first half of 1989, when the Cubans were looking the other way. But this practice stopped instantly in June after Mr. Castro

announced that he would have the contrabandists' planes shot down. He said in a speech on July 9 that illegal overflights of the Cuban territory were "intolerable," that Cuba and the U.S. "really have to discuss how to manage such things" and that "we have to arrange a form of communication between the U.S. and Cuba in this common battle."

The Administration's reaction was simply that it was prepared to "put Cuba to the test." Congressional testimony by a senior State Department official made it clear that the U.S. had no intention of entering into actual negotiations with the Cubans, who should not expect any political rewards no matter what they did in drug interdiction.

This stance was presumably based on the declaration last March by Secretary of State James Baker. In a confidential memorandum to all U.S. diplomatic posts abroad, Mr. Baker said that "no modification of U.S. policy is contemplated in the absence of significant changes in Cuban repression at home and unacceptable behavior abroad inimical to U.S. interest." Issued shortly before Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev visited the island, and intended as an ideological pronouncement, the memo added that "Cuba has not demonstrated a serious intent in improving relations."

Washington's response to Mr. Castro reaffirmed the Baker position, but it raised the crucial question of what really constitutes negotiations. Thus, in rejecting Mr. Castro's idea of "discussing" the best way of controlling drug traffic—done most likely to avoid being pushed into possible political negotiations and pressures for "improving relations"—the U.S. appeared to apply confusing standards.

Common sense as well as cynical self-interest seem to dictate full-fledged talks with Cuba on the desperately urgent matter of drug trafficking. A quid pro quo in the form of broader political talks may open useful new horizons for future relations at a time when the Castro revolution is clearly at a dramatic crossroads.

Cuba's withdrawal from Angola was won through international negotiations with Cuban participation, directed by the U.S., and now there is a Central American settlement. In the past, successful agreements were reached directly in preventing aerial hijacking and on immigration problems.

So what does the Administration do at this critical moment in the American war against drugs? It chooses to insist as a precondition on the extradition of such fugitives as the indicted financier Robert Vesco and Cuban officials indicted by U.S. grand juries for drug smuggling. This is not creative policy.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order previously entered the Senate will go into executive session to consider the nomination of Joseph Zappala, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipo-

tentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The clerk will state the nomination.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Zappala, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS].

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the nomination of Joseph Zappala to be Ambassador to Spain was submitted by President Bush to the Senate on May 2, 1989. On the same day, the nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Joseph Zappala is one of Florida's leading businessmen, with an extensive record of community service in areas ranging from adolescent drug abuse and mental retardation to the organization of political life.

Mr. Zappala is the chairman and chief executive officer of Joseph Zappala & Associates, an investment and land development company based in St. Petersburg, FL. This company has been responsible for the construction of millions of square feet of quality and award-winning projects throughout Florida, with values totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. Through this company, Mr. Zappala developed the first condominiums in Florida, and has been referred to as the "Grandfather of Condominiums." Indeed, he has been responsible for the construction and sale of thousands of single-family residential units and of numerous office and industrial buildings. In the course of his work and his philanthropic activities abroad, he has visited more than 40 countries.

In addition, to his land development and investment business, Mr. Zappala is the chairman of Home Town Investors Inc., which operates a large health care facility in St. Petersburg, FL. Mr. Zappala is the owner and chairman of Tucson Greyhound Park in Tucson, AZ. He also sits on the board of directors of First Union National Bank, and was previously chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Seminole in Pinellas County, FL, a bank which he founded.

Mr. Zappala's philanthropic activities have been numerous. Mr. Zappala serves as president of STRAIGHT, Inc., a drug treatment and rehabilitation program for adolescents with offices from California to Florida. Privately funded, STRAIGHT is the largest drug treatment program for adolescents in the country. More than 10,000 young people have passed through this program, with a total impact upon families of a much higher multiple. In some cases, a patient

takes as long as a year in the program. Mr. Zappala also serves on the board of the College of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Florida in Gainesville, FL and on the board of the Police Athletic League. He is the past chairman of the Pinellas Association for Retarded Children [PARC], an organization which tripled in size under his direction. He is also one of the founders of his local community's opera company.

Mr. Zappala's civic action has also extended to the promotion of political activity among citizens, both through political organization and through fundraising. These activities deserve special notice. He has had a long personal relationship with George Bush. He was active both nationally and statewide on behalf of the George Bush for President campaign, dating as far back as 1979. In that year, Mr. Zappala was the finance cochairman in the Pinellas County, FL, of the first George Bush for President campaign. He cochaired the first Florida fundraiser for the Bush campaign in this year as well. Mr. Zappala was also among the State finance chairmen who met in Chicago with the candidate and then campaign manager, Jim Baker, to assist in establishing one of Mr. Bush's first national fundraising efforts. Mr. Zappala also assisted with fundraising for the Fund for America's Future, a multicandidate political action committee established by Mr. Bush in 1985.

After the commencement of the 1988 George Bush for President campaign, Mr. Zappala served prominently on the National Steering Committee and National Finance Committee as cochairman of the Republican National Committee's Team 100. He currently serves as the national cochairman of finance for the American Bicentennial Presidential Inaugural and as chairman of the Florida Victory Committee.

Mr. Zappala's fundraising talents have also been used on behalf of many religious and charitable organizations throughout the United States. He has received numerous awards, including a prestigious Florida State award for hiring handicapped workers. Mr. Zappala was awarded the Ben Gurion Award, the prestigious Tree of Life Award, and the Gates of Jerusalem Award in 1983 for his internationally recognized commitment to the State of Israel. The Tree of Life Award was personally presented to him by Mrs. Anwar Sadat. This year a park is being named in his honor on the Peace Road between Egypt and Israel.

Mr. Zappala, 55, attended the New York Institute of Finance. He is a native of New York and came to Florida as a young man to begin a career in real estate. He and his wife Carole have four daughters, Kimberly, Valerie, Joanne, and Andrea.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing on the Zappala nomination on June 8, 1989. The committee considered the nomination on June 20, 1989, but at the request of Senator SARBANES, action was not concluded. The committee considered the nomination again on July 25, 1989, and ordered the nomination reported favorably by a vote of 10 to 9. Voting in the affirmative were Senators HELMS, LUGAR, KASSENBAUM, BOSCHWITZ, PRESSLER, MURKOWSKI, MCCONNELL, HUMPHREY, MACK, and ROBB. Voting in the negative were Senators BIDEN, SARBANES, CRANSTON, DODD, KERRY, SIMON, SANFORD, MOYNIHAN, and PELL.

1980 FOREIGN SERVICE ACT

During consideration of the nomination the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, and others raised a number of questions relating to the propriety of the President in appointing as Ambassador a personal friend who had been involved politically in supporting his nomination. Opponents quoted section 304 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 as follows:

SEC. 304. APPOINTMENT OF CHIEFS OF MISSION.—(a)(1) An individual appointed or assigned to be a chief of mission should possess clearly demonstrated competence to perform the duties of a chief of mission, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which the individual is to serve, and knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions and the interest of that country and its people.

(2) Given the qualifications specified in paragraph (1), positions as chief of mission should normally be accorded to career members of the Service, though circumstances will warrant appointments from time to time of qualified individuals who are not career members of the Service.

(3) Contributions to political campaigns should not be a factor in the appointment of an individual as a chief of mission.

Opponents suggested that President Bush was abusing the nomination process by appointing nominees who were qualified only by the donation of large political contributions, instead of maximizing the number of nominees drawn from the Foreign Service.

The committee rejected that argument.

In the first place, the language of section 304 is only hortatory, and not mandatory. In each clause the operative verb is "should." In other words, section 304 hardly does more than express the sense of Congress, and certainly cannot be construed as a direct command or prohibition.

Second, no statute can limit a Presidential power specified in the Constitution. Article II, section 2, states:

He [the President] shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls. * * * and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise pro-

vided for, and which shall be established by law.

Clearly, ambassadors, public ministers, and consuls are offices created by the Constitution, while other appointments not mentioned are only creatures of law. Thus the law can define and prescribe such lesser offices as Secretary of State and appointments in the ranks of the Foreign Service, but it cannot circumscribe the qualifications of ambassadors. An ambassadorial appointment is a constitutional office, and is therefore legally superior to offices created by law, such as the ones just noted. No law can mandate the qualifications of ambassadors, nor require them to be appointed from a specified class of citizens.

Section 304, therefore, is a standard which does not bind the President, and has only as much authority as any other personal standard which a Senator may consider, implicitly or explicitly, in exercising his or her obligation of advice and consent under the Constitution.

QUALIFICATIONS

Nevertheless, Mr. President, Mr. Zappala meets any reasonable interpretation of the hortatory standards of section 304. Mr. Zappala's extensive career as a businessman, financier, philanthropist, and political organizer has given him excellent skills as a negotiator, advocate, manager, and coalition builder—in other words, he has a demonstrated record in the four key areas which must be mastered by any diplomat. In his numerous enterprises, he has been responsible for the well-being and payrolls of over 1,000 employees, and has won awards for his employee practices. Since a large Embassy staff, such as the one in Spain, typically includes more than 100 employees from several agencies, the committee believes that he will be well-prepared for the management problems he will face.

It was also alleged against Mr. Zappala that he was deficient in language skills since he did not know Spanish. This issue has been a matter of concern to the committee for many years. Indeed, in hearings held last fall before this committee, an official State Department study was cited which showed that, in the period 1983 to 1985, 21 percent of Foreign Service officers were promoted into the Senior Foreign Service "despite the fact that they were not qualified at level 3 in any language." Then Under Secretary of State for Management, Mr. Ronald I. Spiers, stated that only three-quarters of Foreign Service Officers meet the full language competency requirements. Yet the Foreign Service manual calls for officers entering the Senior Foreign Service to have a tested 3/3 level proficiency in two foreign languages. Moreover, as a practical matter, Mr. Spiers observed that

an ambassador could not function fully in a foreign language unless he or she were at the 4/4 level of proficiency, which few attain.

Mr. Zappala readily acknowledged his deficiency in Spanish, and enrolled in Spanish language training courses. However, he has been fluent in Italian all of his life. Spanish and Italian are related Romance languages. They have similar grammatical and rhetorical structures. They have the common bond of a similar vocabulary, and transferable language skills. Therefore it is not surprising that Mr. Zappala is already reasonably proficient in Spanish.

With regard to the requirement for an understanding of the problems of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions of the country, it should be noted that Mr. Zappala will be going to Spain in a period during which relations with Spain have cooled under previous Ambassadors. Some observers have felt that previous Ambassadors have spent too much time supporting and building up relationships with left-of-center political forces in Spain to the detriment of building coalitions with political forces more oriented toward strong NATO participation and United States partnership. Under detailed questioning from Senator SARBANES during the nomination hearing, Mr. Zappala demonstrated an ample knowledge of recent negotiations and the removal of United States forces formerly based in Spain.

Moreover, Spain has recently emerged as a key entry point for narcotics from Colombia entering Europe. Mr. Zappala's intensive work with drug-rehabilitation programs should make him especially sensitive to working with Spain on this problem.

Indeed, a few days ago the Spanish Foreign Minister, Francisco Fernandez Ordonez, welcomed the nomination of Mr. Zappala in an interview in the Spanish press. He stated that Mr. Zappala, "is a political ambassador, who is a great friend of President Bush, and who, sincerely, I think, can be very useful for the new phase of our bilateral relations. A person in the confidence of President Bush can be very useful, sincerely, I believe so."

CAREER VS. NONCAREER APPOINTMENTS

During the course of debate, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] stated concerns that President Bush, in his view, was nominating a disproportionate number of persons who were not members of the career Foreign Service.

Specifically, the Senator stated that the President had nominated only 14 career members of the Foreign Service to be Ambassadors, as opposed to 30 noncareer nominees. He stated that this was a proportion of 32 percent career, versus 68 percent noncareer—a virtual reversal of past practice.

However, it was subsequently pointed out that President Bush had made a decision to allow sitting career Ambassadors to finish out their 3-year terms, while recalling immediately most sitting noncareer Ambassadors. Under this count, at the time the Senator spoke, President Bush had 92 career Ambassadors in place or proposed, and a total of 49 noncareer Ambassadors in place or proposed. Thus, the ratio was in actuality 65 percent career, versus 35 percent noncareer.

It should be stated that statistics on career vs. noncareer Ambassadors vary according to the month. The exact percentages change as Ambassadors are nominated, confirmed, resign, or are recalled. The variations from month to month or administration to administration are not significant. Statistics supplied by the Department of State show that the current ratio in the Bush administration, for example, compares favorably to ratios in the Kennedy administration. There is nothing to suggest that, when the current sitting career Ambassadors are replaced at the end of their respective terms, the ratios will be any different from historic practice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an annual "snapshot" of such ratios for each year back to 1961 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL COMPARISON—AMBASSADORS SERVING AT BILATERAL MISSIONS

Year	Number and percentage	
	Career	Noncareer
1961 Kennedy	67 or 72	26 or 28
1961	63 or 64	35 or 36
1963 Kennedy/Johnson	66 or 65	36 or 35
1964 Johnson	74 or 73	27 or 27
1965 (November)	79 or 72	30 or 28
1966	80 or 75	26 or 25
1967	73 or 71	30 or 29
1968	71 or 66	36 or 34
1969 Nixon	68 or 68	32 or 32
1970	72 or 68	34 or 32
1971	73 or 68	34 or 32
1972	72 or 73	27 or 27
1973 (July)	72 or 71	29 or 29
1974 Nixon/Ford	80 or 69	36 or 31
1975 Ford	80 or 72	32 or 28
1976	82 or 70	35 or 30
1977 Carter (August)	86 or 78	24 or 22
1978	92 or 75	30 or 25
1979 (December)	91 or 75	30 or 25
1980	94 or 76	30 or 24
1981 Reagan (January)	90 or 78	26 or 22
1982	85 or 69	38 or 31
1983	86 or 67	42 or 33
1984 (May)	84 or 66	43 or 34
1985 (April)	85 or 70	37 or 30
1986 (August)	82 or 65	44 or 35
1987 (April)	85 or 65	45 or 35
1988 (February)	86 or 64	48 or 36
Starting with 1989, figures include multilateral ambassadors.		
1989 Bush (January)	76 or 62	54 or 38
1989 (June)	92 or 65	49 or 35

Yearly statistics were taken from October with the exception of those years with the month in parentheses.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, finally, a word should be added about the exhortation in section 304 which urges that ambassadorial appointments "should normally be accorded to

career members of the Service." The committee notes that this recommendation merely articulates the practice of the past three decades. Nevertheless, there is no constitutional requirement, and there can be no legal requirement, that the President must follow any particular ratio of appointments, or even that he must take any nominees whatsoever from the Foreign Service.

An ambiguity arises from the fact that an Ambassador chosen from the career services really holds two Presidential appointments simultaneously. He or she is primarily holding a constitutional appointment, under which the President has an absolute right to nominate any person he chooses; his or her appointment in the Foreign Service is not a constitutionally mandated appointment, but an appointment under law passed by Congress pursuant to congressional powers. Thus the rank of Ambassador, as noted above, is legally superior in force and dignity to even the highest rank of the Foreign Service itself. When the President chooses a Foreign Service officer to be an Ambassador at the same time, he confers an additional honor on the nominee in addition to the honors which such a nominee already holds.

The Foreign Service is composed of able, dedicated men and women who have devoted their careers to the pursuit of public service and foreign policy. No country could be without the services of a distinguished and elite corps of skillful and experienced professionals. Every modern President has responded to this need by choosing the majority of Ambassadors from among the ranks of the Foreign Service.

Nevertheless, foreign policy is not a science, but an art. A specific President's foreign policy will be shaped not only by the events and opportunities which are offered, but also by the President's moral and philosophical analysis of the options available, and by the ability to rally public support. For that reason, all Presidents have also included within the ranks of their Ambassadors some of their key political advisers and supporters. Although other countries may rely almost entirely on a professional, technical corps of diplomats, no other country in the world has our practical systems of separation of powers and checks and balances. For this reason, U.S. Presidents always have, and always will, leave their diplomacy by bringing in talented noncareer professionals.

Diplomacy cannot be the private preserve of a closed foreign policy establishment, whether governmental or nongovernmental. It is the very essence of democracy to be open to new ideas and new experiences. The roster

of noncareer Ambassadors who have made outstanding contributions to our diplomacy is too long to tally. Moreover, the vast proportion of them never had diplomatic or foreign relations training. The committee believes that the United States makes an important statement when it sends such distinguished citizens of accomplishment abroad as Ambassadors.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. President, it was intimated during the debate that Mr. Zappala was appointed solely because of political contributions. In the committee's opinion, the qualifications of Mr. Zappala already enumerated speak for themselves, and make the question of political contributions irrelevant. Moreover, the public disclosure forms clearly indicate that Mr. Zappala made no personal political contributions whatsoever to the George Bush campaign in 1988.

However, Mr. Zappala has made substantial contributions to many other political campaigns as may be seen on the public disclosure forms. Indeed, the width and depth of such contribution, to a wide variety of candidates, shows clearly Mr. Zappala's eager commitment to our democracy. The U.S. Supreme Court has said that political contributions are an expression of protected speech under the first amendment; Mr. Zappala has exercised that right vigorously and properly.

Moreover, Mr. Zappala has done more than support a wide variety of political campaigns. He has gone out and encouraged his fellow citizens to do so as well. He has organized committees, directed strategies to involve thousands of others in the political process, and provided invaluable advice to the candidates of his choice. The committee recognizes that few Senators would be Members of this body without the dedicated and distinguished assistance of supporters like Joseph Zappala. The committee does not believe that notable civic action should be a bar to public service as an Ambassador.

Finally, Mr. Zappala's political activity is a very important part of the story of our democratic system. Fellow democracies such as Spain will recognize the important part that such activities play in the preservation of freedom, and will appreciate the insights which his experience will give to their own political process. We honor our allies when we share with them persons whom we ourselves value so highly, and who are so important to the dialog of liberty.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the Senate will be taking up today and tomorrow one of its very important responsibilities under the Constitution, and that is to give or withhold its consent to Ambassadors nominated by the President.

This is a constitutional provision that has been present since the founding of the Republic, and it is one that I take seriously. It seems to me there has been a tendency over the years, perhaps, to permit Senate scrutiny of nominees, as they come before us, to slip, that is to start down the slippery slope, and therefore to place in some jeopardy the effectiveness of U.S. diplomatic representation abroad.

It is that concern which has led to the issue that is now before the Senate. It is that concern which led to a very close vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which reported the nomination of Joseph Zappala to be United States Ambassador to Spain, on a vote of 10 to 9. So the nomination comes to the floor of the Senate by the very narrowest of margins.

The issue here is to some extent reflected in newspaper editorials from around the country, and I would like very quickly to read the titles of some of these editorials, because I think they give a sense of perhaps what the issue is before us. "Anyone For Ambassador." "Amateurs Abroad." "Send the Best Abroad?" "Embassies for Sale." "Trivializing Ambassadors"—and so forth and so on.

Mr. President, what I want to try to do here this afternoon for a reasonable period of time is to look at this issue in a somewhat broader context, and then narrow it down to this particular nomination, to Spain and this particular nominee.

The first thing I want to address is the assertion sometimes made that the President is entitled to his nominee, that the Ambassador simply is the President's person, and the President can pick whoever he wants.

That is not what our constitutional system provides for. In fact, the appointment power is a very cogent example of our constitutional system, and one of "separated institutions sharing powers," in the very apt phrase of Prof. Richard Neustadt. Neustadt, who has written well and frequently on the separation of powers and the balance of powers, perceives our Constitution as establishing separate institutions sharing power. That is very clear in this instance. Article II, section 2 of the Constitution provides explicitly that the President is "to nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint Ambassadors."

In so certifying, the Founding Fathers reinforced the fundamental system of institutional checks and balances and also underscored the importance of America's representation abroad.

The reasons for requiring Senate advice and consent to Presidential nominations were spelled out by Alexander Hamilton in the *Federalist Papers*. As we all know, Hamilton, Jay, and Madison wrote the *Federalist*

Papers as an argument to the Nation at the time, as persuasive brief in support of verification of the Constitution, as formulated in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787, by the appropriate number of States, to go into effect and become the governing charter of this Republic.

In the *Federalist Papers*, in *Federalist No. 76*, Hamilton states in the course of discussing the Senate power:

To what purpose then require the cooperation of the Senate? I answer that the necessity of their concurrence would have a powerful, though in general a silent operation. It would be an excellent check upon a spirit of favoritism in the President and would tend greatly to prevent the appointment of unfit characters from State prejudice, from family connection, from personal attachment or from a view to popularity.

It is interesting that, in contrast to the principle set forth above, one of the arguments advanced is that the President should have a free rein in appointing ambassadors, namely, that they are personal friends of the President. Political loyalty is often mentioned in this connection, and of course in each instance behind that lies very large campaign contributions, as I will shortly seek to show.

It is interesting that Hamilton, in discussing why the Senate was given this power of advice and consent, said it would tend greatly to prevent the appointment of unfit characters from State prejudice, from family connection, from personal attachment, or from a view to popularity.

We operate not only under a constitutional mandate, but the Senate in granting or withholding its advice or consent also needs to take account of the statutory criteria with respect to the appointment of ambassadors.

Section 304 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 sets out the following standards for the appointment of chiefs of mission:

An individual appointed or assigned to a chief of mission should possess clearly demonstrated competence to perform the duties of a chief of mission including, to the maximum extent practicable, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which the individual is to serve, knowledge and understanding of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions, and the interest of that country and its people.

The act then goes on to make these criteria applicable to all nominees to ambassadorial positions whether career or noncareer, providing that nominations will normally be made from the career service while acknowledging that circumstances will warrant appointments from time to time of qualified individuals who are not career members of the service. The statute further stipulates, and I want to underscore this language:

Contributions to political campaigns should not be a factor in the appointment of an individual as chief of mission.

One of the things that has taken place thus far in the Bush administration with respect to ambassadorial nominations is a disturbing pattern of nominees from outside the career service who lack any evident qualifications for the serious ambassadorial responsibilities they propose to undertake. I want to make very clear that the appointment of some noncareer ambassadors is in itself neither unusual nor objectionable and can, on occasion, serve important national interests. But in this instance there has been a marked shift in the percentage of nominees who are being drawn from the noncareer service and there has also been, I submit, a marked lowering of the dimensions of quality and experience that noncareer ambassadors bring to these appointments.

In previous administrations many of the noncareer ambassadors, like some of those nominated this year, brought to their assignments relevant education, professional associations or board memberships, language skills, experience in some aspect of international affairs, and commitment to public service.

Such nominations, both in the past and this year, in those instances in which these practical factors are present, appear to rest on valid reasons over and above political involvement and campaign contributions and money raising.

This year, however, the Senate has been asked to approve the nomination of an unusual number of ambassadorial nominees lacking serious qualifications. Close inspection of the résumés submitted to the Senate leads to the conclusion that in too many cases large donations to political campaigns or successful fundraising activity are the only reason for the nomination.

Indeed, in direct conflict with the Foreign Service Act that I quoted earlier which provides that political contributions should not be a factor in ambassadorial appointments, this year the Senate in numerous cases has been confronted with nominees who demonstrably have no qualifications other than large campaign donations.

Furthermore, this practice has deteriorated to the point where in some instances the Presidential certification of demonstrated competence required with each nomination explicitly sets forth such political involvement.

Under this law a certification of demonstrated competence must be submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with respect to the appointment of each Ambassador. The statute, of course, says that political contributions are not to be a factor, and yet we have been receiving certifications of demonstrated competence which contain in fact highlight in

some instances and are overwhelming dominated by assertions of political contributions as a basis for demonstrated competence.

It is entirely contrary to what was provided for in that statute and contrary, I think, to any common sense view of the basis on which ambassadors ought to be appointed.

I hope we have not yet reached the point in this country where we are prepared simply to accept very large political contributions as a basis upon which to make nominations for Ambassadors.

It is quite true we have had people who have given large contributions in the past who have been approved; some this year and some that I support. But in each such instance this year the record has shown dimensions over and above their political contributions so that one in effect would not look at their resume and ask, now why is this person being nominated as an ambassador and find the answer in appendix A, listing the political contributions.

Not only has the quality of noncareer appointments declined under the current administration, but the number of noncareer appointments has increased dramatically.

Contained in the committee report and in our statement there is a table showing that at July 31 out of 46 country ambassadors nominated, only 15 were career and the rest were political. These are Ambassadors to countries. Of course, have others who hold the title of Ambassador for purposes of negotiations; they may be an ambassador because the Department feels that having that title lends them additional weight and therefore they seek that title. But now we are talking about country Ambassadors. Out of the 46 officially submitted as of the end of July, 30 or 31 were political Ambassadors and 15 were career.

We have updated those figures. As of this date 58 nominations have been submitted as country Ambassadors, instead of 46; 22 are career, and 36 are political. That makes a percentage of 38 percent career and 62 percent political at this point in time.

We have gone back and checked the percentages of other Presidents in terms of nominees submitted to the Senate at this point in their respective administrations—in other words, in the first session subsequent to an election. In no instance did the career percentage drop below 61 percent. With Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, and Reagan the percentage of career nominees never dropped below 61 percent.

This time, thus far in the Bush administration, the percentage is 38 percent. Just 38 percent of the people nominated in this administration as Ambassadors, country Ambassadors, have come out of the career service. In previous Presidents, the lowest was 61

percent. In fact, it went as high as 72 percent.

It is asserted: "Well, President Bush has left these other people, career people, in place." But of course other administrations have done that, as well. The administration is trying, in effect, to include the prior appointments of previous administrations in their numbers.

The important thing, it seems to me, is to compare apples with apples, to see what this administration has done in terms of its own appointments. And what it has done is shift radically the percentage of its appointments which have come from the political sector rather than the career sector. When the noncareer people who drawn in have a manifest lack of the relevant experience and qualifications that one would hope for, we are dealing a blow to American diplomatic service and potentially to American interests abroad.

We are all familiar with very distinguished noncareer people—Senator Mansfield, for example; Averell Harriman; Ambassador Reischauer; David Bruce; and others. Such appointments are welcome because they can in fact supplement our existing diplomatic resources and capabilities. They are individuals who will invigorate and refresh the foreign service rather than drain and demoralize it.

Mr. President, there are some who assert that the contemporary role of the U.S. Ambassador is such that it does not really matter much who we send as Ambassador. I am coming more and more to the conclusion, as I look into this issue and hear the arguments and responses, and in fact questions of some of the nominees, that there are some very widespread misapprehensions or misunderstandings about what an ambassador does.

Some assert that in the age of modern telecommunications the U.S. Ambassador no longer plays a decisive or even particularly functional role in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy, and that for all practical purposes the role has been reduced to its ceremonial aspects; that all decisions are made in Washington; that the Ambassador's counsel is irrelevant; and that a competent embassy staff can serve to present a novice Ambassador from making major mistakes.

I submit that this view is extremely shortsighted and misleading. First, the U.S. Ambassador has very serious responsibilities. The era of glamor, if it ever existed, is long past. At a time when disputes are increasingly being resolved by diplomats, we rely on our Ambassadors not only to help solve problems but to prevent them from arising in the first place. We also look to them to discern and develop opportunities. And we pay significant costs in lost opportunities when they are not competent to do so.

From questions of trade to inter-ethnic rivalries, terrorism, and security relationships, our Ambassadors must know how and where to represent our interests most effectively. Defusing sudden and complex conflicts in a relationship and identifying new avenues of mutual cooperation depend on having astute, knowledgeable and experienced representatives on the scene. This is crucial to U.S. interests—economic interests, political interests, security interest.

Too often an amateur is sent out and manages to get through a term without a major mistake, largely because the career professionals in the embassy are constantly there as a sort of back-up. Often when such an ambassador comes home everyone says, "Well, you see it made no difference. There was no major gaffe. There was no really significant embarrassment. So what difference did it make?"

But that fails to recognize the lost opportunities that could have been developed by a knowledgeable, able, skillful Ambassador. A good Ambassador can make a major difference for our interests in the country to which he or she is accredited.

The range of responsibilities are really very wide. I commend to my colleagues this excellent study called the modern Ambassador, the challenge and the search, prepared by the well-renowned and respected Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. This study, which is now about 5 years old, has a number of different essays discussing the role of the Ambassador. What does an ambassador actually do? There are some very good chapters here on the tasks of an ambassador; a day with an ambassador; running an embassy. What is it really like being an ambassador? How much work is involved? How much time does it take? What are you expected to know? An examination of requirements and qualifications.

The study includes a section called "In Favor of Noncareer Appointments"; another "In Favor of Career Appointments"; and then sort of a summary section, "From Either Source, the Best." And then there are some case studies, including some of disastrous appointments and how U.S. interests suffered as a consequence.

I submit to you if we are serious about being a leading power, then we need to be serious about who we send abroad as Ambassadors. Other countries, when they send their Ambassadors here, invariably draw from the very best of their career service. They recognize that a skillful Ambassador in Washington is enormously important to them in furthering and enhancing the interests of their country.

It seems to me we need to recognize the same thinking in the other direction. We need to perceive that it is not

simply acceptable in today's world, where we no longer have the sort of dominant economic and security power that we had in the immediate postwar period, to overlook the importance of our Ambassadors. We need very skillful people on the scene. And we need them for a wide range of activities, not only representational functions.

We get people who say, "Well, I am a people person. I am really good at getting along with other people." Fine. I do not know that that is a unique qualification, however I do not know that having that qualification excludes having a range of additional qualifications, which are very important to handle these complicated assignments.

Second, sending an Ambassador who possesses no obvious qualifications for the position conveys a very unfortunate message to the country involved. We cannot always send an Ambassador who speaks the language, although I think that is highly desirable wherever it is feasible. Some languages are very difficult. There are not many people who have expertise in them. Often someone may have a range of other qualities—Senator Mansfield, for example—which outweigh or transcend not having the language itself and still enable him or her to be a very skillful, able, and effective Ambassador.

If you do not have these other dimensions or qualifications, I think the message you send to the nation is not our relationship is not important enough to require the appointment of an able representative of our country. In many respects it says that we value the country's climate more than we do its respect and friendship. And to the world at large it says: The United States is not serious about diplomacy: America places a higher premium on political rewards than on furthering its interests abroad. No other major industrial nation appoints its ambassadors in this way, and neither should the United States.

Third, choosing an unqualified ambassador has a demoralizing effect on the career Foreign Service and ultimately will endanger our ability to attract educated, committed young people into professional diplomacy. Our national interests are not, in my judgment, well served if donating \$100,000 to a political party gives one a better chance of being nominated to an ambassadorship than spending 20 years in the career Foreign Service. Would the Members of this body for a moment consider nominating generals and admirals in the same fashion?

Stop and think about that for 1 minute. It happened at one point in our Nation's history and in the history of other countries. What would the reaction be if someone presented some of the same resumes that we are look-

ing at in connection with ambassadorial nominations: Large political involvement, heavy political giving, no real experience in the area of foreign policy or diplomacy or international relations. Suppose it was said of these people: We are going to make them a general, or we are going to make them an admiral.

The impact of this trend on the career Service is manifold. First of all, the kinds of percentages that we are dealing with here, where only 38 percent thus far of the President's nominees for country Ambassador have been drawn from the career Service, means that those who have spent a lifetime working in the career Service, developing skills and talents relevant to moving up the ladder and eventually holding an ambassadorship, the number of opportunities is significantly diminished. In fact, it is clear with this administration that no career person can really hope to serve in an embassy in Europe. All but a handful of the European embassies are going to noncareer people. These embassies, of course, are the ones most sought after by big political givers and those heavily involved in political campaigns.

So, we are denying the opportunity which represents the culmination of a career in the Foreign Service. We are limiting their numbers.

As I indicated earlier, I think there is a case to be made on occasion for taking people from outside the career Service, but the numbers should be far different. They should represent a distinct minority of our ambassadorial appointments, and qualifications and abilities of such nominees should be such that they command general respect when they are selected.

In addition to the demoralizing impact on the career Service of denying opportunities to advance to the very top of their profession, there is another problem. Think what it does to career people to have an utterly amateur ambassador whom they have to, as it were, shepherd through each day. The stories of this are legion.

And, of course, the most important decision that these noncareer nominees make at the very outset is the choice of a deputy chief of mission.

Most of them have the good sense, at least, to recognize that they have to make a good choice because, if they do not, the embassy is in real trouble. Then they do not have a dedicated career servant to carry out the formidable responsibilities of the job while they carry out this other notion of what it is to be an ambassador.

We can see this impact on the career service. The American Foreign Service Association has written about it, sometimes with great feeling. Let me quote from the Foreign Service Journal of

June 19 an article headed "Qualified Ambassadors"—

Are we in the Foreign Service the only ones concerned about the qualifications of ambassadorial appointees? It appears so. And when we sound the alarm, we are seen as interested only in job security for ourselves. But political Ambassadors are not the problem. Ambassadors without qualifications are, be they political or career. The media treats the absence of qualifications lightly, with titters in the gossip columns. Congress, even those Members who know better, shrugs and says nothing.

Maybe they are right. Maybe it is OK to sell our diplomatic posts abroad to the highest bidders, for the taxpayers to bear the burden of paying off political activists, and that American interests in country X, Y or Z be damned. But we don't think so. Diplomacy is too important. We should practice it carefully and with skill and send out our very best to represent us. We recommend a quality control process for ambassadorial appointments for both career and political.

The United States no longer can work its will through the sheer force of economic, political or moral might. Our place in the scheme of things is affected by events and decisions in other countries. We are foolish if we do not seek every legitimate means to influence those decisions. World events touch everyone's job. Ask the steel workers, the UAW, and the farmers. Corporate board rooms understand the importance of the world to their welfare and they are beginning to look to Washington for effective diplomacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full editorial from the June 19 issue of Foreign Service Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALIFIED AMBASSADORS

Are we in the Foreign Service the only ones concerned about the qualifications of ambassadorial appointees? It appears so. And when we sound the alarm, we are seen as interested only in job security for ourselves. But political ambassadors are not the problem. Ambassadors without qualifications are, be they political or career. The media treats the absence of qualifications lightly, with titters in the gossip columns. Congress, even those members who know better, shrugs and says nothing.

Maybe they are right. Maybe it is okay to sell our diplomatic posts abroad to the highest bidders, for the taxpayers to bear the burden of paying off political activists, and that American interests in Country X, Y, or Z be damned. But we don't think so. Diplomacy is too important. We should practice it carefully and with skill and send out our very best to represent us. We recommend a quality control process for ambassadorial appointments, for both career and political.

The United States no longer can work its will through the sheer force of economic, political, or moral might. Our place in the scheme of things is affected by events and decisions in other countries. We are foolish if we do not seek every legitimate means to influence those decisions. World events touch everyone's job. Ask the steel workers, the UAW, and the farmers. Corporate board rooms understand the importance of the world to their welfare, and they are begin-

ning to look to Washington for effective diplomacy.

How important is skilled diplomacy to reducing the threats of war, to having some impact on the international flood of illegal drugs, to the health of our world's environment? The list of international issues that are important to Americans now and which will be more so in the future is long.

How do we convince the people of a foreign country that we are serious in the pursuit of our country's objectives if the chief representative of the United States in that country can't speak the language, knows next to nothing about that country, and has no visible qualifications to represent the United States there? We can't.

AfSA urges the administration and Congress to consider whether the time has come to rethink the question of ambassadorial qualifications. Experience should have taught us the painful lesson that not just anyone is good enough to represent all of us. We, also, should care enough to send the very best.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, let me turn to the specific situation before us today. I want first to address the general question that we are considering, the nomination of an Ambassador to Spain.

Where Spain is concerned, the United States has economic, political, security, cultural, and historic interests of the highest order. Spain has undergone a profound political and economic transformation since the death of Franco in 1975 and the subsequent establishment of democratic institutions.

In 1975, Spain moved to democracy. It was a profound development, and so perceived not only in Europe and in this country, but throughout the world. In fact, the Spanish transition is being looked to by some nations in Eastern Europe as offering a model from which perhaps they might follow.

A Cabinet minister from Hungary recently spent some time in Spain for the express purpose of examining how Spain accomplished this transition, both political and economic; how it moved to democracy, moved to an open economy, and became part of the European Community.

Since this turning point in Spain, throughout this 14-year period, the United States has been represented in Madrid by ambassadors with distinguished careers in the Foreign Service with experience directly relevant to their service in Spain.

Since Spain moved to democracy, American administrations, Democratic and Republican alike, recognizing the importance of Spain to our interests and the sensitivity of the Spanish situation, have sent ambassadors with distinguished Foreign Service careers.

From 1975 to 1978, we were represented by Ambassador Wells Stabler. Ambassador Stabler, a career officer with more than 30 years' experience, including posts in Rome and Paris, was at the time of his appointment the principal Deputy Assistant Secretary

of State for European Affairs. He spoke Spanish and had had extensive management experience in the Department.

Ambassador Stabler was followed by Ambassador Terence Todman, a fluent Spanish speaker. Ambassador Todman had served as Ambassador to Chad, Guinea, and Costa Rica. At the time of his nomination to be Ambassador to Spain, he was the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

There are about 15 Assistant Secretaries in the Department. There is the Secretary, the Deputy, several Under Secretaries, and then the Assistant Secretaries. So at the time he was appointed to go to Spain, Ambassador Todman had risen to this rank in the Department.

From 1983 to 1986, we were represented by Ambassador Thomas Enders. He came to Spain after serving as Ambassador to Canada as U.S. representative to the European Community and as Assistant Secretary for Economics and Business Affairs. For the 2 years prior to his appointment, he held the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. So he had been in the European Community, a major ambassadorship in Canada, Assistant Secretary in the Department of State.

He was succeeded by the fourth in this line of successive career ambassadors to serve in our Embassy in Spain—to give you some sense of the importance which administrations, Republican and Democratic, have attached to this assignment—Ambassador Reginald Bartholomew, who served from 1986 to 1989. Ambassador Bartholomew served in the Department of Defense from 1968 until he joined the Foreign Service in 1974. A Spanish speaker, he had previously been Ambassador to Lebanon and special negotiator for the United States Greek base negotiations. He was recently confirmed as Under Secretary of State for Security Affairs.

Although the transition of the immediate post-Franco period has ended, new changes are underway. In a March 11 article appropriately entitled "The Next Transition," the Economist noted:

Spain is at a painful but unavoidable turning point in its recent history. The country is changing gears. Having entered the European Community just 3 years ago, Spain already plays a crucial role in the rapid movement toward European economic integration which will culminate in Europe in 1992.

Mr. President, let me just very quickly mention a few of the reasons why Spain is such an important factor and needs to be recognized as such, and why I think four successive ambassadors over a 14-year period were highly respected members of the career Foreign Service, diplomats of demonstrated competence and experience.

First of all, we have Spain and NATO, a delicate and complicated situation. Spain obviously occupies a strategic position. Spanish participation in NATO was finally agreed upon after a popular referendum. It is limited in the sense that Spain is not fully integrated into the NATO command, which in and of itself raises certain questions about how things would work if, in fact, a crisis were to take place.

The United States has had base facilities in Spain since 1953. They have just been renegotiated. We are closing down one of them, the airbase outside of Madrid, at Torrejon. We must undertake implementation of the agreement that has been negotiated; not an easy matter, involving sensitive issues.

This new agreement on United States-Spanish bases was entered into force barely 4 months ago. It represents a significant change in military arrangements which date back to 1953. The agreement redefines the United States-Spanish military relations in the context of Spain's affiliation with, but not its full integration into, the NATO command in the context of Spain's increasingly active involvement in all aspects of European affairs.

Implementation of that agreement, including redeployment of the F-16's heretofore stationed at Torrejon, is just beginning. In my view, it is hardly an opportune time to put U.S. diplomatic representation on automatic pilot with an inexperienced ambassador.

Second, it is important to note Spain's role in the European Community. In fact, since 1986, Spain's economy has grown the most rapidly of any country in the European Community. At the end of June, Spain finished its first 6-month term presiding over the European Community. The Spanish Prime Minister was the presiding officer under the 6-month rotation system which the Community follows.

The Prime Minister, Felipe Gonzalez, was perceived by all as having done an outstanding job as President of the European Community in Spain's first rotation. The Spanish Government sought to demonstrate its commitment to the European Community, and in fact at the EC summit in June of 1989 Prime Minister Gonzalez engineered a very significant compromise with respect to plans for monetary union in the EC. He was able to bring together Prime Minister Thatcher and President Francois Mitterrand—no small achievement, as we all will recognize. I might also note that a Spaniard is currently serving as President of the European Parliament.

So Spain is important to the United States for a number of bilateral reasons—important because of its position and role in NATO; important because of its role in the European Communi-

ty; important because of its role in Latin America.

Spain, traditionally regarded as the mother country of 18 Latin-American nations, is making continuing efforts to expand its presence, economic and political, in the Western Hemisphere. In fact, Spain is interested not only in expanding their ties with Spanish-speaking Latin America but also with the Hispanic community in this country. I understand there are plans for the Spanish Prince to visit the U.S. Southwest later this year to establish ties with Spanish-speaking people living in the United States.

Spain has had a special interest and a longstanding degree of influence with the countries in Latin America, regarding itself as the mother country in culture, in history and tradition, and of course, in language. In fact, citizens of Spanish-speaking Latin American countries enter Spain without a visa, just one small reflection of that relationship. Spain trains a number of Latin American diplomats at its own diplomatic academy, and the Latin Americans see Spain's entrance into the Community as giving them a potential spokesman for important interest.

I think it is particularly important in this period to have a U.S. Ambassador sensitive to the potential significance of the Spanish experience to the nations of Latin America.

I spoke earlier perhaps of the role which Spain may play as a model for a transition to democracy on the part of, for instance, Eastern European countries. The Hungarian Minister of Justice, traveling throughout Western Europe and talking with constitutional scholars in particular, was studying successful democratic transformations in Spain.

So we are dealing with a country of major import. I am not sure we fully appreciate that in our society at large. I think the Department has appreciated it, and that is reflected in the quality of the career Ambassadors we have sent to Spain since Spain became a democratic nation in 1975.

Spain will host the Olympics in Barcelona in 1992. In that same year Madrid will be Europe's official "cultural capital." The European Parliament, as I indicated, now has a Spanish member presiding as its President in the next 2½ years. From all reports the Spanish now see themselves as playing a major role in the Community and, indeed, an increasing role on the world's stage, particularly as it relates to Latin America.

Further, the Prime Minister has now called for elections early. They will be held later this fall, and they may well be an important watershed in recent Spanish history.

Mr. President, let me turn to the nominee now before us to take this very important and sensitive assign-

ment. My own view, very candidly put, is that who we send as an Ambassador to any country is important, and it is obviously important in the thinking of that particular country. Therefore, we ought to be concerned in each and every instance that we send the very best we can. But we have to recognize, just as a matter of reality, that there are some countries, because of their role in the world, their size, the importance of their economy, their political position, perhaps their cultural and historical leadership—and now we are talking about the premier Spanish-speaking country in the world—where we need to be even more sensitive to the nature of the representation we send.

In this instance, we have a case in which, in my judgment, disregarding the guidelines set forth in the 1980 Foreign Service Act and the critical interests and complex issues in the United States-Spain relationship, we propose to send an Ambassador to Spain who possesses no prior experience or educational background in foreign policy, no particular interest in or knowledge about Spain, and no Spanish language ability. In fact, one is struck by the paucity of Mr. Zappala's civic involvements as listed in his response to the committee's questionnaire. I ask my colleagues to refer to appendix 2 in the committee's report in which biographical information is set out.

Furthermore, despite the fact that the statute specifies that political contributions should not be a factor in making nominations, they appear to be the sole reason behind the nomination of Mr. Zappala. In fact, a good part of Mr. Zappala's certification of demonstrated competence, which I earlier indicated is required to be sent to the committee with each nominee, is devoted to enumerating his heavy political giving.

This is the report to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Subject: Ambassadorial nomination: Certification of Demonstrated Competence, (Foreign Service Act, section 304(A)(4). Post, U.S. Ambassador to Spain. Candidate, Joseph Zappala.

It is short enough, Mr. President, that I am going to read it, the full certification of competence to the Senate. I particularly want Members to note the focus and attention which is placed on his role as a political campaign contributor even though the statute says "contributions to political campaigns should not"—not—"be a factor in the appointment of an individual as a chief of mission."

Mr. Zappala, 56, is presently Chairman and Chief Executive Office of Joseph Zappala and Associates, in St. Petersburg, Florida; Chairman, Home Town Investors, Inc., and Owner and Chairman of Tucson Greyhound Park, Tucson, Arizona. Mr. Zappala is also presently on the Board of Directors

of First Union National Bank and the board of the College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Florida, Mr. Zappala is President of STRAIGHT Inc. and a member of the board of the Police Athletic League.

Mr. Zappala was National Finance Co-Chairman for the American Bicentennial Presidential Inaugural and Chairman of the Florida Victory Committee. Formerly Mr. Zappala was on the George Bush for President National Steering Committee in 1988 and the National Finance Committee Co-Chairman for the State of Florida as well as National Co-Chairman for the Republican National Committee's Team 100. Mr. Zappala was also Co-Chairman of George Bush for President 1979.

Mr. Zappala is a graduate of the New York Institute of Finance. Mr. Zappala's impressive business background in real estate combined with his civic activities qualify him as an excellent candidate for U.S. Ambassador to Spain.

And then it has a short concluding paragraph.

Members of the Republican National Committee's Team 100 are those who gave more than \$100,000 to the Republican National Committee in the last campaign. In fact, there are at the moment eight persons from that list who have been nominated by this administration to be ambassadors.

If anyone were to ask me, what is the one single thing that he or she can do that might lead to ambassadorial appointment, I think it is becoming increasingly clear that the answer is to be a member of Team 100.

It also becomes apparent as we examine this situation that a development with respect to the responses to the questionnaire which is itself a small thing in a way reflects a larger proposition. Nominees are required to fill out an extensive questionnaire submitted to them by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The questionnaire asks them about community involvement, employment, financial information, and includes a number of detailed questions about personal résumé and background. For instance, it asks a question of government experience: "List any experience in or association with Federal, State, or local governments including any advisory, consultative, honoraria, or other part-time service or positions not shown in question 8."

In response to that question Mr. Zappala listed all of his political activities. I am not quite sure I recall any government experience properly speaking but that is where he listed his political activities.

Right at the end, or almost at the end; the questionnaire asks:

Are there any factors other than the information provided above which particularly qualify you for the position to which you have been nominated?

In response to that question Mr. Zappala said, and I am now quoting from his questionnaire:

I am known as a coalition builder. I am able to organize my colleagues and peers to

action in support of worthwhile civic, charitable, and political causes.

This same questionnaire is submitted to all the nominees for ambassadorships that come before the committee. In response to this question, a close friend of Mr. Zappala's and a fellow real estate developer, Mr. Melvin Sembler, who has been nominated by the President to be United States Ambassador to Australia and whose nomination, I presume, in due course we will be considering, responded, and again I quote, to the same question:

I have been known as a coalition builder, able to organize my colleagues and peers to action in support of worthy civic, charitable, and political causes.

Mr. President, I did not make a mistake. I did not by mistake here happen to read Mr. Zappala's answer instead of Mr. Sembler's to that question. The fact of the matter is they gave virtually identical answers to this question in their separate questionnaires.

Do they regard this process as serious? Do they think the committee has an important responsibility to discharge? And, if so, why are they giving us identical answers to the same question?

The Washington Post looked into this in an article on the 24th of June, 1989; "Two Would-Be Envoys Are Frequent Partners—Nominees Even Shared Phrases." In the article they explain that this occurred because Mr. Zappala's public relations consultant filled out the questionnaire for him by copying the words of Mr. Sembler's public relations consultant who had filled out Mr. Sembler's form.

These nominees cannot even fill out their own forms. We have public relations people treating it almost as a joke. Let me just read from the Post article, which I will include in the RECORD.

Aides to the two developers said in separate interviews that they, not their bosses, were responsible for the strikingly similar prose in the five-page questionnaire that every ambassadorial nominee must file with the committee.

"Those are my words," said Tampa public relations consultant Pat Lewis. She said she completed Sembler's form using the same description of Sembler she often employed during the past five years while serving as his speech writer and publicist. Lewis said, however, she was not certain how her words got onto Zappala's form.

Bruce Bannard, a Zappala associate, said he knew. Bannard said he filled out Zappala's form and had a copy of Sembler's résumé, borrowed from Lewis, with him at the time. "Whether consciously or unconsciously," Bannard said, he lifted the wording.

The Washington Post in an editorial commenting on this said:

Modular testimony. Pre-fab (by someone else) self-description. It doesn't inspire a whole lot of confidence. Can the would-be ambassadors be trusted to enter into dialogue with their host governments if they,

apparently, cannot be trusted to write a few lines on their own qualifications?

Mr. President, I spoke earlier about how, on occasion, the service can be refreshed by bringing people in from the outside. One of the nominees we considered earlier was Governor Orr of Indiana, to be Ambassador to Singapore. He was approved by the committee, approved by the Senate and is now in Singapore on assignment.

Governor Orr, to his credit, filled out the questionnaire in his own hand. It was very clear that the responses to the questions were his own and that he obviously had the ability and the capacity to respond intelligently. He brought to that nomination not only some distinguished political experience in this country, actually governing, actually administering, but also a long-standing interest in the Far East. He had 60 some of 18 trade missions to the Far East in the course of his tenure as First Lieutenant Governor and later Governor of Indiana. I only mention that by way of contrast.

Numerous articles and editorials from around the country have commented on the matter of this nomination. The St. Petersburg Times, in fact, the hometown newspaper of Mr. Zappala, said:

In the past, some new Ambassadors' lack of preparation for their jobs has been offensive to host countries and has prevented our Government from taking advantage of important diplomatic opportunities. Whether political appointees or career diplomats, our Ambassadors should possess the same qualifications that we have come to expect of foreign diplomats serving in this country. Otherwise, we run the risk of creating touchy situations that even successful St. Petersburg developers are not capable of getting us out of.

Mr. President, I have not based this argument on any contention about Mr. Zappala as a person. I concede, for purposes of this argument, that he is a fine person. I am sure that any of us would be happy and privileged to have him as a friend and neighbor. He has been successful in his business pursuits, and in fact, the majority refers to him as the "grandfather of condominiums" in Florida.

But I am simply making the point that when asked to give its advice and consent to ambassadorial nominations, the Senate must keep in mind that the Nation's interests are at stake. This is a serious business. It is not something to be done as a matter of political reward. It is simply not adequate or appropriate to have ambassadorships treated as rewards for campaign fund-raisers.

There was a warning signal back in February of this year, and I have to confess that I—and I guess others—did not pick up on it; we should have picked up on it at the time and come back with a counterwarning. An article appeared in the New York Times, on

February 20 under the headline. "Ex-Finance Chairman Complains Few Jobs Go to Bush Fundraisers." That was about a month into the administration.

The article begins:

Robert A. Mosbacher, Sr., the Commerce Secretary, who was finance chairman of President Bush's campaign, says he is distressed that more campaign fundraisers have not been rewarded with political appointments. He blamed officials in the administration, but not Mr. Bush himself, for favoring political operatives over fundraisers for posts at all levels of Government.

Skipping through the article, we find the following:

Mr. Mosbacher said in the interview that he planned to bring the issue to the attention to White House personnel officials, and that he hoped to speak directly to Mr. Bush about it.

The Commerce Secretary, who ran the Bush fundraising efforts in the primaries and the Republican Party's drive to raise millions of dollars from wealthy donors, said there were "several hundred" fundraisers who deserved appointments to ambassadorships, sub-Cabinet posts or lower level jobs on commissions who were being neglected. The campaign had a national finance board of some 350 people in the primaries, and for the general election, 249 individuals and corporations, gave at least \$100,000 apiece to the Republican Party.

"Quite a high percentage of those who have been helpful have not gotten anything," Mr. Mosbacher said.

The article goes on to say:

More than a dozen people who gave at least \$100,000 to the Republican Party last year, or helped solicit millions of dollars more for Mr. Bush, are being tapped for jobs as ambassadors or as policymakers at sub-Cabinet levels.

It then goes on to discuss this practice, mentioning the two people that I have mentioned here today, Mr. Zappala and Mr. Sembler, and others we are considering in the committee. Actually, this article ends with Mr. Mosbacher saying about another fundraiser:

"By all standards, she deserves something," Mr. Mosbacher said. "She raised a lot of money, worked hard."

Mr. President, I am not being a purist about this. In the past along with my colleagues, I have participated in cases of looking the other way and allowing some nominees to go through despite some doubts and misgivings. But I have been, driven to this fight by a combination of circumstances. I do not know how many here remember the movie "Network", in which Peter Finch at one point throws open the window and says "I am just not going to take it anymore." That is the point I finally reached with these ambassadorial nominations.

We had a list of nominees in the committee. It included some career people. It also included noncareer

people with some dimension to them. But it also included some noncareer people who had absolutely no dimension to them. It was not a matter of one or two, but more. So one looks at the situation, sees at the numbers, and realizes that there has been a marked shift in the number of noncareer people, and at the same time a sharp drop in the quality of many of the noncareer people.

I am going to make a comparison because I want the point to be understood. I am going, in effect, to impose upon Ed Ney, who is now our Ambassador to Canada, to help make the point I am trying to underscore here today.

Mr. Ney is a noncareer appointee to Canada. He came before the committee with an impressive and distinguished record. He was very active politically, involved both as a participant and as a giver, but he is also chairman of Paine Webber, Young & Rubicam Ventures; he was for many years chairman and chief executives officer of Young & Rubicam, the world's largest independent advertising and communications company, and he was selected repeatedly as the outstanding person in his profession. He served on the board for International Broadcasting. He was on the President's private sector survey on cost control. He was on the Policy Advisory Committee of the U.S. Trade Representative, on the advisory board for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, on the board of trustees of the Urban League, and Director of the Center for Communications. He had been vice chairman of the Foreign Policy Association. He served on the board of trustees of a number of outstanding academic institutions, including Amherst College, NYU Medical Center, Columbia Graduate School of Business, visiting committee of Afro-American Studies at Harvard, frequent and repeated contact in Canada both at the personal level and on the business level. He speaks French, highly relevant in a country that is bilingual. And there are a number of other activities which I have not enumerated.

Ambassador Ney is a noncareer appointee. He has had substantial political involvement but when you look at his record and review his papers, it is clear as you read the résumé that there is a solid basis on which to send this person as Ambassador to Canada.

The answer to the question, why is this person being nominated to be an Ambassador to Canada? Was not to be found solely in the appendix listing his political contributions, although there was such an appendix and the contributions were significant. But the answer was not in that appendix solely. The answer lay as I have tried to show in a wide range of other activities and involvements.

I submit we have to start taking these appointments seriously. We can no longer treat them as political throw-aways. We must get off of this money merry-go-round. We cannot simply accept the proposition that solely because someone can write large checks he or she should then be on the short list for an ambassadorship. I am frank to say I regard check-writing as more of a problem than extended political involvement; at least an active citizen is taking part in the political process of trying to make our democracy work. But here we have instances where, as Secretary Mosbacher complained, few jobs go to Bush fundraisers. The Secretary was simply distressed that more campaign fundraisers had not been rewarded with political appointments.

But we have other interests to consider. If we are going to reduce these ambassadorial nominations to this level, perhaps we should put certain countries up for auction, then at a certain hour there will be a public bidding at the auditorium of the Department of State and whoever bids the most will get the assignment. At least in that case we would put the money into the Treasury of the United States and use it to offset the deficit. Of course the winners could also pick their DCMS. We could bring in three or four prime candidates and put them on display, and say, these are the long-time professionals in the career Service who have been trained for ambassadorial or diplomatic posts; one of these people will come with this job so if you bid for it you will get one. Doonesbury did a series of cartoons suggesting this very thing. Mr. President, I think it is time to get serious about these nominations. The process has deteriorated markedly with respect both to the overall numbers and the specific qualifications or, more accurately, put, lack thereof, of some of the nominees presented to us. I do not think we ought to let the process deteriorate any further. It has gone too far already. Now is the time to say stop. I urge my colleagues to reject the nomination of Joseph Zappala, to be United States Ambassador to Spain.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ].

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I agree with my friend and colleague from Maryland that Spain is indeed important, that Spain has now been without any ambassador since the 12th of March of this year and that it is indeed time to get serious about this nomination.

It is the practice of the Senate that a single Senator can hold up a nomination for quite a bit of time. This nomination was presented to the Senate 5

months ago, to the day, I believe, and the hearing took place 4 months ago. Since that time even though there has not been an ambassador in Spain this nomination has been held up, by a single Senator.

Yet we are now hearing that we are supposed to take the process seriously, that it is time to get serious about this nomination.

I listened carefully to the speech of the Senator from Maryland, and as a matter of fact since we are on the committee together I have heard elements of it before. He has heard elements of my response.

But let me first talk about Joseph Zappala and let me say that I understand that some Senators would judge a man of Mr. Zappala's background somewhat differently than I. His background, frankly, is not much different than mine in coming here to the Senate. His background, I might say, is far broader than many of my colleagues here in the Senate prior to their time of coming here.

His background is one of a businessman of very wide accomplishment, of a businessman who has branched out far beyond the community where he began.

In the report that the Foreign Relations Committee prepared about Joseph Zappala, he is listed as one of Florida's leading businessmen with an extensive record of community service in areas ranging from adolescent drug abuse and mental retardation to the organizations of political life.

He is indeed one of Florida's leading businessmen, having really fulfilled the American dream, having done what few have been able to achieve.

(Mr. WIRTH assumed the chair.)

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. He came from New York. He went to Florida. He became a developer. He went without capital. He went with his dreams. He went with his ambition. He went with the ability and desire for hard work.

He has built millions of square feet of quality and award-winning projects throughout Florida. He is one of the larger shopping center developers in that part of the country.

As the distinguished Senator from Maryland has mentioned he originated the idea of condominiums in Florida which has led to very rapid development in that State. While some of that may not have much to do with diplomacy, I submit to the Senate that this is a man of considerable accomplishment. I will discuss, as we talk about what is required about diplomacy, how this kind of experience applies to that, because more than simply diplomatic experience or experience in the State Department is important to the business of diplomacy.

Mr. Zappala operates a large health care facility in St. Petersburg. He is the owner and chairman of the Tucson Greyhound Park in Tucson,

AZ. He sits on the board of directors of the First Union National Bank, and was previously chairman of the board of the First National Bank of Seminole in Pinellas County in Florida, a bank which he founded.

In addition to being most successful in his own right, starting from ground zero, accomplishing things of magnitude in his State and across the Nation, the report of the committee on Foreign Relations further states: "Mr. Zappala's philanthropic activities also have been numerous." He is president of STRAIGHT Inc. STRAIGHT Inc. is the largest drug treatment program for adolescents in the country. More than 10,000 young people have passed through this program. This is an accomplishment of great merit, in my judgment, and one which may have some relevancy for Spain particularly when we consider the fact that Spain is now thought to be an entry point into Europe for drugs.

So in confirming Mr. Zappala we would be sending to Spain an ambassador who has broad experience in drugs and how to deal with drugs.

Another important asset Mr. Zappala would bring to his assignment is that, in the words of the Foreign Relations Committee's report, "He has had a long personal relationship with George Bush."

It is indeed one of the most important elements of an ambassador's job that there be a relationship with the Chief of State. Which would the Spanish Government prefer? Would it prefer a bureaucrat, somebody who has been a career diplomat, carefully and cautiously in most instances working their way up the ladder of diplomacy? Or would they prefer a friend of the President? Would they prefer a person who has had a long, personal relationship with George Bush?

The Senator from Maryland pointed out an interesting fact, that the State Department is a very large organization with many officials. There is, as the Senator pointed out, the Secretary of State, a Deputy Secretary of State, three Under Secretaries of State, and 21 Assistant Secretaries of State, and probably 40-odd Deputy Assistant Secretaries of State. And it is to that bureaucracy that the Ambassador reports.

The question is: Does the Prime Minister of Spain, when he talks to the Ambassador, want somebody who is going to go through all these bureaucratic steps? If he really has something important, does he want somebody with that capacity, or does he want a person who has a long, personal relationship with George Bush? I submit to you that the people in Spain who are politicians themselves would indeed prefer someone with a long, personal relationship with George Bush.

That relationship was involved with finance, as indeed many political relationships are. Joseph Zappala co-chaired the very first Florida fundraiser for the Bush campaign, back in 1979. He was on the National Steering Committee, on the National Financing Committee, and his fundraising talents were not only used for the political sphere but for many religious and charitable organizations as well, from which he has won numerous awards.

The Foreign Relations Committee report continues and says: "Mr. Zappala meets any reasonable interpretation of the hortatory standards of section 304," of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to which my friend referred. Continuing the quote:

Mr. Zappala's extensive career as a businessman, financier, philanthropist, and political organizer has given him excellent skills as a negotiator, advocate, manager, and coalition builder—in other words, he has a demonstrated record in the four key areas which must be mastered by any diplomat. In his numerous enterprises, he has been responsible for the well-being and payrolls of over 1,000 employees, and has won awards for his employee practices.

I know that many in the Senate do not share that kind of background. As a matter of fact, there are few people in the U.S. Senate who do have a business background similar to Mr. Zappala's. I am one of those few who came here as a businessman. I am one of those few in the Senate who is not a practicing lawyer. I am one of the few in the Senate who is really an entrepreneur and started his business much as Mr. Zappala did, and moved forward and indeed employed over 1,000 people.

And so I am particularly appreciative of the background of Mr. Zappala, and what it takes to get there. I did not come to the Senate with prior experience in diplomacy. I have no education in diplomacy. And yet I am on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I indeed help make the foreign policy of this country.

My friend from Maryland stated that Mr. Zappala cannot even fill out his own forms. He has a speech writer and a publicist. There are 100 Senators here in this body and many of them have speech writers and press secretaries. So the fact that he has a speech writer or a publicist really should not be so unusual to those of us in the Senate.

It was alleged that Mr. Zappala was deficient in language skills. But yet he is totally fluent in Italian, and has been all of his life. As the report once again says, "since Spanish and Italian are related romance languages, with similar grammatical and rhetorical structures," there is "no reason to believe that Mr. Zappala will not be reasonably proficient in Spanish by the time that he takes up residence in Madrid."

And indeed, as I noted, he has had a lot of time to become familiar with Spanish, as this nomination has been dragging on and on. It is a shame. If we were to get serious about the business of diplomacy and serious about the business of getting an ambassador to Spain, this nomination should not have been held but should have been brought to the floor.

We should have voted it up or down months ago, so that we would be properly represented in this important country.

I might say since 1960 there have been a number of ambassadors who have been political appointees. I do not know exactly the years that these people served there. But the following people served as political appointees to Spain, during the period subsequent to 1960:

John Lodge, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., Angier Biddle Duke, Frank E. McKinney, Robert F. Wagner, Robert C. Hill, Horacio Rivero, and Peter M. Flanagan. Eight people, some of whose names I am most familiar with, have served as Ambassador to Spain as political ambassadors since that time, since 1960. I presume that many of them are Democratic appointees.

When we are considering ambassadors, we must consider the role that they play at these Embassies where they serve. First, they are personal representatives of the President as well as representatives of the Nation, and they deal on a regular basis with senior political leaders of the countries to which they are assigned. In the case of noncareer ambassadors it is one politician dealing with another politician, rather than a bureaucrat dealing with a politician. And I submit, Mr. President, that the politicians, the political leaders of Spain, appreciate the fact that the President sends a friend. And, indeed in the case of Joe Zappala, that is what is happening in Spain. The President is sending a friend.

In addition, ambassadors play an important role, particularly during the days of multibillion dollar trade deficits, in helping American businesses find opportunities abroad for creating new markets. Does Mr. Zappala's background fit there? It most certainly does. Does it fit there more than the normal bureaucrat? It most certainly does.

I have had businessmen say to me they have gone to countries and sought help from the Embassy. They have complained to me that they get there and nobody in the Embassy even understands what a letter of credit is.

Finally, an ambassador is responsible for managing quite a large number of people on the staff. The Senator from Maryland and I recently held a hearing for the new Ambassador to Fiji. Both of us were surprised to learn that there were 80 people employed by

the American Embassy in Fiji. In Spain, the Embassy employs about 650 Americans and Spaniards. And the Americans represent many Government agencies. We are talking about a nominee, Mr. Zappala, who has led an organization in excess of 1,000 employees. Indeed, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations says that he has won awards for his employee practices.

I might say the business of managing 650 people in an embassy is not always quite so simple. There are often a number of different agencies of Government represented in a single embassy. Very often there are many interagency battles that go on.

I submit that somebody who is outside of that, but yet has managerial experience, one who has not been involved in those turf battles, who carries no baggage in that regard, is indeed in a better position to deal with that than someone who comes from within the bureaucracy itself.

Let me talk for a moment about the number of nominees who are political nominees and those who are career nominees. I think I find myself in agreement with my friend from Maryland when he says that in certain situations, certainly career diplomats are of great value and are needed. Even though traditionally in some of those positions, political appointees have gone, for instance, to the United Nations. Some of our best ambassadors of recent years have been Ambassadors to the U.N. Vernon Walters was widely hailed. So was Jeane Kirkpatrick. Both of them were political appointees.

This President, however, in that important post, has chosen not a political but a career appointee, the former Ambassador to Israel, Tom Pickering, whom I have known for a number of years. I know Tom, and can say the President could not have made a better choice for this job if he wanted to show his esteem for the career service.

However, if we are going to say how many ambassadors are career appointees and how many are political appointees, the question is should we include those career ambassadors who are left in position? Should we include those who are in the midst of their normal 3-year terms and are allowed to continue in figuring out the averages?

When a new President comes on board, ambassadors, whether they are career or political appointees, as a matter of form send in their resignation. The result is that all can be replaced. This President chose to continue virtually all the career ambassadors who were in the midst of their terms. He did not accept their resignations. Should those people be included as appointees at this point? Or should only those people whose resignations were

accepted, who were mostly political appointees be considered? Or should we also consider the group that was reappointed and left in place and did not require a nomination procedure? I submit that they, too, should be included.

When they are included, the numbers are more as they have been in the past. As a matter of fact, they are very much like they have been in the past and in my judgment we cannot count only those we are called upon to confirm at this time.

It has been said that we are seeing a flood of political nominees, from Republican "Team 100" contributors, those who gave \$100,000 or more to the President's election campaign. The truth is there are only about a half a dozen who have been asked to become ambassadors. I thought there were half a dozen. My friend from Maryland says eight. I will certainly take his figures.

But that is a half dozen or 8 out of 150 Ambassadors we have representing us around the world. That is hardly a flood, in my judgment. How does an individual give \$100,000? There are limits, and the limits are far less. I might say, when someone gives outside, not directly to the candidate, when they give to the party for so-called party building, then there are no limits.

This was not something started by this side of the aisle. This was not something started in the last campaign by the Republicans. However, it was copied by the Republicans when it was started by our friends on the other side of the aisle and it is not surprising to me that friends of the President would respond to such a solicitation.

Does a friend of many years who has succeeded greatly in business, a friend who responds to a request for a contribution, thereby become disqualified to serve as an ambassador? Is a contribution to be deemed just given for some kind of advantage? Cannot a large contributor also be judged as being a friend? Cannot a large contribution be judged as a sign of friendship? Or of a commitment to a philosophy? Cannot it also be judged as a sign of success?

The fact that some political appointees have been successful enough in business to contribute large amounts of money to the political process should not be held against them, as some would say. The only thing that this person has accomplished is that he has made a political contribution. I would review again the accomplishments of Joe Zappala, and I would also say that in the report by the Committee on Foreign Relations it is said:

Finally, Mr. Zappala's political activity is a very important part of the story of our democratic system.

And I agree that his political involvement should not indeed be held against him. Certainly, his political involvement over many, many years was not aimed at being an ambassador at some later point. I know Mr. Zappala and I know indeed that is the truth.

As I have said, Mr. President, one of the most important jobs ambassadors have today is to help American companies find new business abroad. Successful businessmen know how to make deals; they know how to get things done. Having them as ambassadors helps the State Department carry out this very key task to find new markets, to help reduce our trade deficit. So I am pleased we have businessmen who go abroad.

Again, Mr. President, I perhaps, with my background, am more comfortable. Perhaps the great distinction between me and some of the critics of these nominees is the fact that my background is not dissimilar to theirs and my background is, on the other hand, dissimilar, not very close to what the background of what most in the Senate is.

Frankly, Mr. President, one of the reasons I am in the U.S. Senate is that many people in my State thought that my experience as a businessman and with a career in business was just the kind of values that were needed here in the U.S. Senate. I agree that my approach to problems of wanting to get things done is rather frustrating when compared with the way we sometimes work here. I am used to going to point A to point B in a rather direct line and not wasting too much time in doing so.

The fact that Mr. Zappala does not speak Spanish, although, as I said, by this time he has had time to become proficient in it and also since he is fluent in Italian and romance language, his ability to learn Spanish is much improved.

I might point out very often career diplomats are also not proficient in the language of the country where they go. Sometimes there is no logic to it at all. Not so long ago a diplomat who was going to go to Saudi Arabia came to my office. He was fluent in Mandarin Chinese, so fluent and so skilled and so familiar with the history of China that when President Nixon went there, he was the interpreter and adviser to President Nixon. He spoke Chinese with such proficiency that he was the interpreter. Now he is going to Saudi Arabia. He does not speak Arabic. In going to Saudi Arabia, I think he is most capable. Maybe his Chinese will come in handy if in reading some of the manuals that go along with the missiles China sold to Saudi Arabia.

Another Chinese expert is going to Botswana. A third Chinese expert is going to Haiti. So there is no logic to some of the career diplomats and where they go, nor is the language

matter one of great difficulty that will not soon be overcome.

Mr. President, I believe that this President is not, in the words of Alexander Hamilton certainly not an unfit character. This is a man who has achieved much in life who, indeed, should withstand and closest scrutiny by the Senate of the United States. He has been a man of accomplishment, not only in the field of business but also in the field of charity. He has done much to improve the welfare of his fellow human beings.

So I congratulate the President for sending Joe Zappala to us. I am pleased that his nomination has finally reached the floor of the Senate, in October, after it has been discussed in the Senate for over 5 months. It is time that we fill that slot. It is time that we send an Ambassador to Spain. It is time that we vote on Joe Zappala and send him as an accredited diplomat on to Spain where he will serve this country, in my judgment, in the most admirable fashion. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nomination of Joe Zappala to be the Ambassador to Spain, the nomination made by the President of the United States.

I make no apologies for the fact he has been a very successful businessman and has been able to contribute to the Republican Party. I make no apology that he is a close friend to the President of the United States, and there have been some indications that the government in Spain is pleased by that nomination to realize that they have that kind of direct input.

Let me try to put the debate in perspective, at least from my point of view. There has been much discussion indicating that the President is relying more and more on noncareer appointments. If you put it into perspective, if you go back and look over the record, starting in 1961-62, the Kennedy years, 64 percent were career, 36 percent noncareer; 1963, the Kennedy-Johnson years, 65 percent career, 35 percent noncareer. Go to the Nixon years, 69 percent career, 31 percent noncareer.

If the 28 nominees who are before the Senate are confirmed, the ratio under the Bush administration would be approximately 65 percent to 35 percent.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MACK. I say to the Senator, I appreciate him asking me to yield, but I have been here now some 2 hours, and I would like to finish my statement. I graciously listened to your comments for some length of time. I am sure you will have opportunity to respond.

Mr. SARBANES. I assume the Senator will be happy to yield at the end of his statement.

Mr. MACK. I will be delighted to see he has time.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator from Florida will be happy to yield for some comments.

Mr. MACK. I will determine that at the end of my comments.

The Senator from Minnesota, Senator BOSCHWITZ, and I came to the U.S. Senate with similar backgrounds. As he indicated, maybe this is why we have a sensitivity to what has been said with respect to Mr. Zappala.

I began my career in 1982, having spent 16 years in the banking business, never acted in politics and the question was raised, am I qualified, am I capable? I was pleased to respond and react to those questions and said that I would like people to look at, my record, my involvement, what I had accomplished in my career before making a determination to run for the House, then for the U.S. Senate.

I make the same comments with respect to Joseph Zappala, an individual who has been successful in his business career and very involved in his community. I think most people would recognize the fact that raising a family of four children, active in business, one could make the argument that that is all that is required.

But, again, as Senator BOSCHWITZ pointed out, there are many accomplishments by this individual: his interest in helping his community, helping children, helping to solve the drug problem. He was involved in getting the STRAIGHT program started in 1976. He served as president of the STRAIGHT program. Again, we have heard that tens of thousands of individuals, young children, have been helped because of that involvement.

In addition to that, he served as president of the Pinellas Association for Retarded Children, again making a significant difference, and again fundraising capabilities played a role. Funds were cut off. Mr. Zappala and others banded together and raised the money that in fact has helped thousands of kids. There are 600 enrolled in the program today.

I mention that because it shows that special sensitivity, that special need to be involved, that special belief that one person can make a difference. He has done that in his life. He has indicated his ability to succeed, again just looking at it from the community aspect.

When you look at his business ventures, again we share a common background. He started a bank in 1971, very successful—successful in business, in the development of construction. Again, I make no apologies for an individual being successful. I think we want to send a message that, yes,

there is a role for successful business people in Government. In fact, there are many of us who think they are needed.

In addition, I should like to touch for a moment on this question that keeps coming up about, well, he is not qualified because he has not served before. There was a letter sent by Robert Wagner, one of the former Ambassadors to Spain, to several Senators and I would like to read just a portion of it.

He says, "I have had the privilege and opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Zappala. He impresses me as a fine and decent American citizen who through study has a real grasp of the responsibilities of Ambassador. I have found him to be intelligent and conversant with what is going on in Spain and the United States relations with Spain."

"As you may remember, I was named Ambassador to Spain by President Lyndon Johnson in the 1960's after my terms of office as Mayor of New York. Therefore, I had a special concern that we have good representation there. The Ambassador can make a concrete contribution to the people of Spain and of course to the people of the United States."

He goes on further to say, "As one of Florida's most distinguished businessmen, Joe's remarkable record of community service also makes him one of the State's leading philanthropists. He has been a leading adviser and fundraiser for religious and charitable organizations as well as political campaigns throughout the United States."

And then he says in parentheses, (The latter is something that we never held against Averell Harriman.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter from the National Italian American Foundation as well as from the Pinellas Association for Retarded Children.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL ITALIAN
AMERICAN FOUNDATION,

Washington, DC, September 6, 1989.

DEAR SENATOR: The National Italian American Foundation strongly urges your support of the nomination of Joseph Zappala to be our next Ambassador to Spain. Since it has been over four months since President Bush first nominated Mr. Zappala for this post, we also request the Senate leadership to immediately set the vote.

We strongly agree with Senator Charles Robb, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee who said, "in the case of Ambassadorships, I am inclined to give great deference to the judgment of the President, since an Ambassador is not only the United States representative, but also the personal representative of the President. And, ultimately the President's accomplishments in foreign affairs will depend on the strength of these and other appointments."

President Bush nominated Joseph Zappala on the basis of an outstanding career as a businessman, civil and philanthropic

leader in Florida. Joe is the highly successful President and CEO of Joseph Zappala and Associates, an investment and land development company based in St. Petersburg, Florida. He also serves as President of Straight, Inc., the largest national drug treatment program for adolescents producing some 10,000 drug free young people in 15 states. He is also past chairman of the Pinellas Association for Retarded Children. He is the recipient of the prestigious Ben Gurion Award, the Tree of Life Award and the Gates of Jerusalem Award for his commitment to the State of Israel. In fact, later this year a park is being named in his honor in the Peace Park between Egypt and Israel.

According to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee "Mr. Zappala's extensive career as a businessman, financier, philanthropist and political organizer has given him excellent skills as a negotiator, advocate, manager and coalition builder. In other words, he has a demonstrated record in the four key areas which must be mastered by a diplomat." The committee also cited his "strong knowledge" of the major issues in current U.S. Spain relations.

Joseph Zappala is eminently qualified to be our next Ambassador to Spain. We commend President Bush for selecting such an outstanding individual for this important post. We are obviously proud that he chose such a prominent Italian American to serve in Spain especially since it will be one of the three main nations celebrating the Columbus Quincentenary in 1992. The Order of Sons of Italy in America joins us in urging a prompt and favorable vote on Mr. Zappala. At their National Convention in August, a resolution was passed expressing their "full support" of Joseph Zappala and urged the Senate "to expeditiously schedule a final vote on confirmation." We especially agree with the conclusion of their resolution which stated "any further delay would be unwarranted and unfair to Mr. Zappala, President Bush and the Italian American community."

With best wishes we are

JENO F. PAULUCCI,
National Chairman.
FRANK D. STELLA,
President.

PINELLAS ASSOCIATION FOR

RETARDED CHILDREN,

St. Petersburg, FL, September 14, 1989.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: The Pinellas Association for Retarded Children is a non-profit corporation that serves retarded children in Pinellas County. We accept everyone regardless of the severity of their disability or their ability to pay.

We also serve youngsters who are visually impaired, hearing impaired, neglected, abused, emotionally disturbed and nonambulatory.

Currently there are approximately 600 children and adults in the PARC Program. We provide year-round residential services for 135 children and adults. PARC programs include: Preschool, Speech, Physical and Occupational Therapy, Residential Services, Sheltered Workshop, Vocational Training and Job Placement. Hundreds of people in our community are able to walk today as a result of the physical therapy received as very young children in our Preschool Program. Each year we graduate approximately 30 children from our Preschool Program and many of them are able to attend regular first-grade classes in the public school system.

Every month at least one adult leaves our program for community employment and independent living. During our history we have made it possible for hundreds of people to leave state institutions for the mentally retarded to live and learn at the PARC Center with all the benefits of the community available.

We are involved in the Special Olympics and have a very successful recreation program.

PARC has approximately 1,000 dues-paying members and over 1,500 volunteers. The volunteer sector is the backbone of this organization.

Joe Zappala, past president of the Board and Board Member for 12 years, without a doubt has been the most outstanding contributor to the success of this organization. Under his leadership at the Board level, we climbed out of a period of financial problems to a stable, sound fiscal organization.

Mr. Zappala single-handedly was responsible for raising the money to construct our first 10,000 square foot Sheltered Workshop. Mr. Zappala has introduced our organization to all of his family, friends and business associates.

The ripple affect of this presence on the Board of Directors is immeasurable.

Over the years Joe has won several awards at the state level for his outstanding contributions to the handicapped. He has been very generous to the Pinellas Association for Retarded Children with his time, talent and donations.

Each year I call Joe Zappala to contact his friends to invite them to the variety of special event, fund-raising affairs that we conduct for the benefit of the children we serve.

Joe Zappala has made a significant impact on the lives of the children in this community.

BERT MULLER,
President.

Mr. MACK. In closing, I say again I want to focus on what this individual has accomplished in his life. That is where we are going to determine whether the individual has the ability to be successful in this job to which the President has appointed him.

I think that record speaks very clearly. This is a man who can take on challenges, has proved his ability to succeed, and I am confident he will be a great success as our Ambassador to Spain.

Now I am delighted to yield to my colleagues from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I would like to ask the Senator about these numbers. Is the Senator representing on behalf of the administration that in all the subsequent appointments of Ambassadors they intend to make, they will be career people in order to sustain this ratio that he talked about?

Mr. MACK. I say to the Senator from Maryland that I certainly cannot speak for what the future appointments or nominations might be, but I think it will be on the record, in the years to come, probably very close to the 65-35 ratio and, in fact, when you look down the information which I took out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from August 3, 1989, that is a

fairly constant ratio, and so I feel confident that will occur in the future.

Mr. SARBANES. We have no assurance of that from the administration. The basis on which you can make a comparison is to take the nominations this administration has made and compare them with the nominations that other administrations made.

Now, other administrations kept their Ambassadors in place until they eventually got around to making the nomination, either at the end of their tenure or perhaps even earlier. What the figures show, on a comparative basis, on the basis of the numbers thus far appointed, is that this administration has completely reversed the ratios so that their nomination of political people far exceeds anything that has occurred at this point in previous administrations.

If the Senator is prepared to say for the administration, well, this is the end of it; we are not going to do any more of these political people; we have done them all right up front and this is the end of it; and they are all going to be career, and therefore eventually we will work back into a percentage that looks reasonable and compares with the others, that is one thing. But as far as I know they have not made any such commitment. On the basis of that we have seen so far and know so far, they have really left the career service to the side and they have gone all political. A former Under Secretary—

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I would like to reclaim my time.

Mr. SARBANES. A former Under Secretary of the Department, in referring to what was—

Mr. MACK. I would like to reclaim my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. MACK. I believe I have answered his question, and I would like to reclaim my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Chair.

Again, I say in my closing remarks, I think we have addressed this question with respect to ratios. I am not trying to make any blame on future appointments that the President of the United States is going to make with career versus noncareer. If you look at the record, if you add the 28 appointments that are now waiting to the numbers that are in the field, you are going to come out with a ratio of roughly 65-35. We can debate in the future what the ratio should have been or could be, but the reality is it is going to be very close to 65-35.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Will the Senator from Florida yield for a comment?

Mr. MACK. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. I say to the Senator from Florida that this administration has said time and time again that it fully intends to maintain the normal two-thirds to one-third ratio that has existed between career and noncareer appointees.

Mr. MACK. Again, I thank the Senator for his comments.

In closing, I encourage my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support this Presidential nomination to Spain. He is a qualified individual, an individual of whom we can all be proud.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Trashing the Foreign Service," to which I made reference be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO BUSH MISTAKES: TRASHING THE FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Ronald I. Spiers)

In June, I left the U.S. Foreign Service after a career of almost 35 years. I would not have traded these 35 years for anything. The variety, excitement and opportunity for participation in history-making events could not have been matched anywhere else. Yet I departed with a deep unease about the future of our country's diplomatic establishment.

America's diplomats—unlike her intelligence and military services—have no domestic constituency. Indeed, there is general ignorance about what a diplomat is and does. I have been misidentified as a Forest Service ranger and as a member of the Foreign Legion. Others still dismiss us as "striped-pants cookie-pushers," engaged, so they imply, in one long round of cocktail parties. But our diplomats work at the very heart of our most important national interests. Journalists write about foreign policy, scholars and historians analyze it, academics teach about it, but only our diplomats are practitioners.

Indifference toward diplomacy seems to be shared by many in Congress and the new administration. Two stories in *The Post* last week illustrated the problem. One noted that Bush has thus far appointed fewer Foreign Service officers as ambassadors than either Ronald Reagan or Jimmy Carter—favoring instead political appointees, including one ambassadorial nominee who has no job history and no college degree. The other story noted that the Senate has introduced 120 amendments—most of them involving pet projects and special interests—to the State Department authorization bill.

We wouldn't treat our military so contemptuously. Yet diplomats—who run greater dangers these days—seem to be fair game for the politicians. They face dangers, disease, discomfort. Their pay, while adequate, is far below what people of their caliber could command in the private sector. Often their spouses can't be employed in the countries to which they are assigned. They face a constant threat from terrorists—since the Korean War, more ambassadors have been killed on duty than all the admirals and generals. And what do our Foreign Service officers get for their troubles? Potshots from Congress and the White House.

In even the most professional foreign service, of course, there can be bad apples, and that may be the case with Felix Bloch, a career diplomat who is under investigation by the FBI for possible involvement with the KGB. But what's striking about the U.S. Foreign Service—in comparison with almost every one in the world—is how rare such cases have been. The last one, to my knowledge, was in the early 1960s.

Foreign Service officers, like our military officers, are in a "bottom-up" system. They enter the service through a highly competitive process. As many as 18,000 apply to take the exam; at the end of the process, approximately 235 new officers are selected each year. The competition continues throughout an officer's career. When he reaches first-secretary rank, which is equivalent to an Army colonel, he can compete for promotion to the "flag rank" of the Senior Foreign Service, a 700-member cadre that staffs the senior embassy and headquarters positions. An officer who elects to compete for the senior service has six annual shots at promotion. If unsuccessful, the officer must retire. This means that each year some very good officers are forced to leave, but it ensures that only the very heaviest hitters get to the top.

We need good diplomats. The problems the United States will increasingly face in the future are going to require more diplomatic skill and less military heft—problems like drugs, terrorism, pollution, waste management, acid rain, global warming, deforestation and desertification, regulation of outer space, debt management, trade regulation and a plethora of others. The focus of our attention will move from Afghanistan and "Star Wars" to rain forests and nuclear-waste dumps. Most of these issues are characterized by the irrelevance of force to their solution and by the requirement for diplomatic skill in mobilizing the collaborative efforts of the world community for dealing with them.

Yet the United States seriously underfunds its diplomacy. We spend less than two-tenths of one percent of our federal budget on this vital function. The \$300 billion we spend on defense dwarfs the less than \$2 billion we spend to conduct our foreign relations. The \$600 million projected as the cost of a single new-generation B-2 bomber would be more than adequate to give us the tools we need to be effective. We could devote the funds we need to match our Soviet counterparts in language skills (when I was ambassador to Turkey we had no one in our embassy who was as fluent in Turkish as were a number of the Soviet embassy staff members; the same was true of Urdu when I was in the same position in Pakistan).

The cost of one B-2 would give our embassies the money needed to permit our personnel to travel in the hinterlands of the countries they are supposed to know. It would let us do the "representation" work that is often the lubricant for influencing key decision makers and opinion leaders in other countries. It would permit us to abandon the wasteful economies we are now forced into by skimping on maintenance of our embassies abroad, by sacrificing training or, alternatively, accepting long staffing gaps in our overseas missions. These long gaps means that an officer who will have spent several years developing contacts and accumulating knowledge, experience and cultural "feel" cannot pass on what he has learned to his successor, who must then start from scratch. These are foolish econo-

mies which cut deeply into our diplomatic "readiness."

Congress won't even let us economize. Surplus military bases are finally being closed, but we in the Foreign Service are unable to close unnecessary posts abroad because of some vested congressional interest. So we pay to keep them going while cutting more important areas of expenditure. Last year Congress decreed that the State Department would be penalized by a \$50-million "fine" if it closed any of its posts. This year the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is trying to make the department open a post in the city he served in as a young diplomat!

Then there is the problem of ambassadorships. Once upon a time, generals were appointed on political grounds. Commissions were sold and senior military officers were selected for their political connections. The story of Britain's misadventures in the Crimean War demonstrated the folly of these traditions, and today no one thinks of appointing military leaders because of their political campaign contributions. I believe professionalism is as important in our diplomatic service as it is in our military and intelligence services. This does not mean the diplomatic service, any more than the military, can be a law unto itself. Nor does it mean the political appointees can't make outstanding ambassadors. But things are getting out of hand.

The politicization of ambassadorships, which accelerated under the Reagan administration, is if anything getting worse in the Bush administration—despite the general expectation that the president, who had served in foreign-affairs positions himself, would change things. The new secretary of commerce set the tone soon after taking office, when he was quoted as complaining about the slowness of paying off political supporters with appointments. By the end of May, the president had selected 44 non-career and 28 career ambassadors.

Competent non-career ambassadorial appointees are welcomed by the career service. I have worked under several, including David Bruce and Elliot Richardson, who were my chiefs when I was posted in London. These were people with serious interests and extensive backgrounds in foreign affairs, superbly qualified to contribute effectively to conduct of American foreign relations. However, appointees of this caliber are now very much the exception." And during President Reagan's eight years the percentage of political appointees rose from 25 to 40.

This has two effects. First, it demonstrates a casualness, a lack of seriousness of purpose, on the part of the United States. Imagine the reaction of Bahamians when the newly appointed ambassador listed as his qualifications for the job the fact that he came from a state where gambling was a big industry and that he liked to play golf. Twice in recent years, political ambassadors had to be removed for outrageous personal or sexual behavior.

Second, it makes management of a career service difficult and ultimately weakens our diplomatic capability. We have had a recent exodus at the top of our service as some of our best senior personnel—people who have been trained and paid at taxpayer expense—find they have no future in the Foreign Service because people whose only qualification is the size of their political contributions have preempted positions that career officers had spent a lifetime preparing to occupy. They leave, and the United States

loses valuable assets. It is having a corrosive effect on some of our brightest younger and mid-level officers who no longer have the spur of a good chance at ultimately holding positions at the highest leadership levels.

Two arguments are made on behalf of this practice. Both, in my view, are specious. Political appointees, it is argued, have direct access to the president that career appointees do not have. This is seldom the case. In any event, ambassadors who go directly to the president tend to get short shrift. John Kennedy let his impatience show when some of his appointees tried to exercise this purported access too freely.

A second argument is that the president needs people on whom he can rely to carry out his policies because they know and share his viewpoint. However, the career service is—like the military—a disciplined service. There is no uncertainty about who sets policy. Presidents generally have more trouble with free-wheeling political people than they ever do with career professionals. President Reagan faced the problem of a political appointee ambassador who went off to Libya trying to implement his own policy toward Gadhafi.

Finally, it needs to be understood that an ambassador is not a "policy-maker." Policies are made in Washington, and carried out in the field. This is probably the basis for the oft-encountered contention that ambassadors are essentially "messenger-boys." So, it is asked, what difference does their qualification make? I encountered this contention frequently in the last administration. There is a self-fulfilling aspect to this canard, since Washington will avoid dealing through or listening seriously to people of whose qualifications they are skeptical.

In fact, an ambassador's energy, persuasiveness, judgment, contacts, substantive knowledge—his ability to act coolly improvise quickly on the basis of experience or well-honed instincts and intimate knowledge of U.S. goals and objectives—can be crucial in a crisis. There is no substitute for on-the-spot knowledge of other cultures, languages, personalities and what buttons to push to get results.

I believe the Bush administration should show much greater care in its selection than it has to date, as well as recognize the impossibility of keeping an astute and effective career service if its members conclude, as too many have, that the opportunities for promotion to the most responsible positions either at home or abroad are greatly restricted.

At last count before I left the State Department, more than 100 senior officers were without assignment. These so-called "corridor walkers" are people with the skills, background and experience—and the years of training—to represent us with credit abroad. It is an unconscionable waste of an important national asset. Foreign diplomats shake their heads in wonder at this American profligacy.

There is a set of plaques in the main lobby of the Department of State headquarters in Washington. Each May the names are added of those members of our diplomatic staffs who have been killed in the line of duty in the previous 12 months.

When I joined the Foreign Service in January 1955 it held 72 names, covering a period of 175 years. During the 35 years I was a Foreign Service officer, 90 names had been added—most of them victims of terrorist action. It angers me to see their legacy of diplomatic skill and professionalism being squandered by Congress and the administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. DeCONCINI.

Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is it necessary to get time yielded or is the floor open?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. DeCONCINI. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has been recognized.

Mr. DeCONCINI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I would like to speak for a few moments on the nomination of Joe Zappala as U.S. Ambassador to Spain. I am very pleased and thankful that the Senator from Maryland agreed to let this matter come to the floor for a vote. I understand his strong feelings in the area of ambassadorial appointments and I have listened a number of times when he has spoken.

I also thank the majority leader for scheduling this nomination. He has a busy job on his hands, as the President pro tempore of this body knows better than anybody else, to schedule things. The majority leader committed to a number of us that he would bring Mr. Zappala before the Senate so we could, as we say, work our will and vote up or down on this nomination. The majority leader has been accommodating to this Senator and others.

Frankly, Mr. President, I believe that much of the uproar about this nomination is more of a tempest in a teapot. Whatever the language that was included in the Foreign Service Act of 1980 on the qualifications of Ambassadors, the Constitution is quite clear on the President's prerogative in this field. The Constitution says, and I quote, "He," meaning the President, "shall nominate, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls."

I am not trying to deny that the Senate plays a very important constitutional role. That is what we are doing today, debating and discussing qualifications and the ability of this individual, Mr. Zappala, to serve as the Ambassador to Spain.

I have always believed that our responsibility is to give the President his prerogative unless there is a compelling reason that the person is unqualified or cannot hold that office. But I feel the President should be allowed certain discretions in this area. That is what he has done in this instance.

The important part of this process is to be satisfied when, from the President's point of view, he has a nominee that can do the job he believes is necessary. As the architect of our Nation's foreign policy, the Chief of State must be comfortable with those who are going to implement his foreign policy. That is what the appointing process is all about. If our Founding Fathers thought otherwise, they

would have said that the President must choose from the rank and file, or he must choose with some criteria laid out in the Constitution. We know that is not the case. There is a protection that the United States Senate exercises—in the event a nominee is appointed and for reasons of a lack of qualifications or other reasons that the nominee is not in the best interests of the United States—then the Senate should rise and refuse to approve the nomination, whether it be for an ambassador or for a court of appeals or the Supreme Court.

I also reject the idea that you have to be a foreign policy expert to be an ambassador. Ambassadors must perform a number of functions. They must manage an embassy, of tremendous size, such as the one in Spain. Many of you have visited there, as I have. That is not a small little enterprise in and of itself. The Ambassador to Spain is responsible for overseeing approximately 250 employees, for reading all cables that come through, numbering hundreds per week. The agencies represented including the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the USIA, and the Defense Department are all under his control, all reporting to him as though they were reporting to the President of the United States.

Each person attached to the Embassy is directly responsible to the Ambassador, and they must work in concert as a team representing the United States abroad. Also, as Spain only became a member of the European Community in 1986 and as all Europe is moving toward an economic union planned in 1992—a big role for any ambassador and any person who is there—Mr. Zappala's business background should serve as an asset in this post. Clearly, previous experience in running a successful business is extremely relevant to the successful running of an embassy.

Ambassadors also directly represent the American people. I believe our Ambassador should reflect the regional, economic, and cultural diversity that make this country unique. Representing America cannot be left to a small group of foreign policy officials, the elite in the Foreign Service and the State Department who would like to think that only they can put forward the policy of the administration that is in power. That is not what our system is about. That is why we elect a President every 4 years—so we have an opportunity to have a new policy put forward and not one that is left over or which might continue. We need citizens from all walks of life to demonstrate the ideals that this country is all about.

One of the issues raised by the opponents of this nomination is that Mr. Zappala does not have the experience in international affairs. I believe that

while such experience is very useful and can certainly be of some benefit to the United States, it is not fair to say that a lack of this experience is a reason to deny the confirmation of this nominee.

There are a number of examples, I might say. First, private citizens, often with little or no previous experience in foreign affairs, have served our country with distinction as ambassadors abroad. We have had business people, and entertainers serve as our ambassadors. Some have been controversial and have not done a good job. We have also had some that have come through the ranks of the professional side that have not done a good job.

As an example of one previous ambassador who has done a good job and came from the ranks as a private citizen with no experience which immediately springs to mind is Anthony Motley. Ambassador Motley was an Alaskan real estate developer. That is what Mr. Zappala has done for a good part of his life. He has not developed real estate in Alaska but in Florida.

Mr. Motley was appointed to Ambassador to Brazil by Ronald Reagan in 1981. He had no previous experience in foreign policy whatsoever except foreign travel as have many, many Americans. He had been, however, a strong supporter of President Reagan's campaign. Yes, he contributed money to the campaign of Ronald Reagan. He faced a battery of skeptics in the press and elsewhere similar to that now being faced by Mr. Zappala.

I would like to read part of an article from the New York Times commenting on Ambassador Motley's performance:

In a year he gained extraordinary access to the highest levels of the Brazilian Government earned the highest regard of other ambassadors in Brasilia, won over the most traditional diplomats in his own Embassy, and gained the singular tribute of being hailed our Ambassador by major Brazilian newspaper.

This Ambassador's work in Brazil earned him a further post in the Reagan administration because of the outstanding leadership he demonstrated, while coming with no previous amount of foreign relations experience. He was appointed as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs. There are few observers of international affairs—and I think I can include our professional diplomats in that number—who would deny that he has served his country well in both of these posts.

Another example is Clare Booth Luce, a well-known playwright, politician, and a woman of renown throughout the United States. Clearly, her appointment was a political appointment for her past assistance and support to the Republican Party. She served as Ambassador to both Brazil and Italy. Her tenure as Ambassador to Italy was

summed up in the Washington Post editorial as follows:

When she began her post in Rome more than 3 years ago she had to combat Italian fears and suspicions of a woman Ambassador and amateur diplomat. When she left she had the respect and admiration of the Italian people, if not always their agreement.

What a compliment for someone with no diplomatic experience to have stepped into a very sensitive role as Ambassador to Italy and received that kind of compliment for her service to this country.

She was a political appointee. Which ones are not political appointees, perhaps, when you really get to the bottom line? She ended her term in office with accolades and quotes from President Eisenhower as having done a superb job.

We tend to forget that Elsworth Bunker, the premier diplomat of the past generation, was in the sugar refining business before being appointed as Ambassador to Argentina. He served well there and with great distinction—as a matter of fact, for 35 years in the Foreign Service. Following his first appointment as ambassador in 1951, Ambassador Bunker served in some of the toughest assignments in our diplomatic corps, including Vietnam.

In serving his country Ambassador Bunker won the Presidential Medal of Freedom and the Grand Cross Knight of the Republic of Italy. He went from sugar refiner to diplomatic trouble-shooter around the world on behalf of this Nation. Perhaps Joe Zappala is a future Elsworth Bunker.

If this body does not confirm him, we will never know, but I am satisfied that if he is not an Elsworth Bunker, he could indeed be a Clare Booth Luce, and he can serve at least in a capacity equal to that prominence.

We cannot tell today, but neither will the Senate know unless we move forward and approve this nomination.

There are other examples of private citizens who have become fine ambassadors representing the United States and who have played major roles in foreign policy transmission and direction—IBM Chairman Tom Watson, who served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union. It was only appropriate that the United States send the chairman of the leading example of our capitalist system to the capital of the largest Communist system.

What a compliment that was to the United States and to Mr. Watson, and what a fine record he was able to leave as a legacy in serving this Nation.

I point also, to the Coors official, Mr. Sam Zakhem, who served in Bahrain. Here was someone who was treated with skepticism. Here was a man whose parents were immigrants from Lebanon. He lived the American dream, wanted to give back something

to his country. He made some money in this great Nation of ours and he made contributions to the Republican Party. He served this Nation with eagerness and exuberance in Panama.

When I was there visiting with him, it was interesting to talk with the crown prince, who went out of his way to tell me how influential this businessman ambassador was in getting the Bahraini Government not to vote in favor of sanctions by the Arab League against the United States after our strike against Libya.

The crown prince told me himself; I asked if the Ambassador asked him to raise it. He said, "No, I raised that because it is important for us to know how we feel about this individual in Bahrain."

It was there that our servicemen and women were able to recover from the tragic attack on the *Stark* during our operations in the Persian Gulf. It was in part due to the Ambassador Zakheim's effort, that these berthing rights were guaranteed.

I believe Joseph Zappala will exemplify those standards set by these great citizen diplomats of the past and become a first-rate ambassador. He will bring to the job a number of qualities and qualifications that will serve him and the country in good stead.

He is a man who is used to meeting challenges. The son of an immigrant, of an Italian immigrant, Joseph Zappala has built an investment and land development company in Florida that has been responsible for projects worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

He truly has adopted the American can-do spirit. He wants to do what is good for his country. He has also been extremely active in philanthropic activities. On an issue close to my own heart, he was cofounder and president of STRAIGHT, Inc., a drug treatment and rehabilitation program for adolescents with offices around the country today.

He is involved in the University of Florida School of Veterinary Medicine, as well as many other associations, including one benefiting retarded children. He has been a strong supporter of Israel since his youth, when, as a 17-year-old, he volunteered for the Army during World War II and was sent to train outside Dachau. There he learned firsthand of the atrocities of the Holocaust, and has worked ever since to ensure that the lessons learned there are shared with succeeding generations.

He has been awarded the Ben Gurion Award, the Tree of Life Award, and the Gates of Jerusalem Award for his commitment to the State of Israel and the welfare of the countries in the Middle East. There was recently a park named in his honor on the Peace Road between Egypt and Israel.

Much has been made of Mr. Zappala's inability to speak Spanish. I must say that certainly is a tremendous benefit of any ambassador. Many ambassadors, including the IBM president, Ambassador of the Soviet Union, did not speak Russian, and yet he executed that position very well.

I point out that Mr. Zappala speaks Italian, and I firmly believe that he can familiarize himself with Spanish. He understands the Italian culture and life, and I must say, though, different as it is, there are many similarities between those two nations and the cultural values that bring them together. I have little doubt that he can become very fluent in Spanish in a short period of time.

The issues being raised on this nomination are not directly related to Mr. Zappala's qualifications. He has been caught up in the middle of a struggle over what has been seen by critics as an inordinate number of political appointments to ambassadorial positions, and that for some reason, this is a bad thing.

Politically motivated appointments to ambassadorships have been with us since the beginning of the Republic, and I daresay will continue, and should continue. If a President is foolish enough—and some are—to put someone into a position representing the United States, being the President's voice in that country, who is unqualified and does not understand the country, and is unable to articulate and to represent the United States and the views of the President, the President pays the price, not just that individual.

The President has made clear in recent statements that he expects his appointments to be in line with previous administrations and, if anything, he wants to reduce the number of political appointees. I do not know what else we can ask.

During the debate on the MacNeil/Lehrer Report last Friday, it was noted that while 36 of the 58 people President Bush has nominated to be ambassadors are political nominees, the President has also left nearly 100 career ambassadors in place around the world.

What are we going to say? If one tips one more over than one is supposed to, by somebody's arbitrary number, then there are no more political ambassadors? Each one should be chosen first on their merit and their relationship with the President, and second, they should be chosen on whether they can represent the United States and the President of the United States.

As we face that obligation under the Constitution to confirm or not to, to advise and consent or not to, it is the responsibility of us to look at what the individual is, and not judge it on numbers.

To sum up, Mr. President, Mr. Zappala is one of Florida's leading businessmen. He has a long history of involvement in community service, and he has been active in the public arena.

I have no doubt that he will make an excellent Ambassador to Spain from this country; he will make our country very proud. He comes from a background that is dedicated to success and to hard work. He has a close relationship with the President of the United States. I do not know what else we could ask for.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PELL.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PELL. I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Did I understand the Senator from Arizona to be citing a New York Times editorial with respect to Ambassador Motley?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a colloquy?

Mr. PELL. I yield the floor for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DECONCINI. If the Senator would yield, the particular article is in the New York Times, dated November 24, 1982, "Our Man From Alaska Goes Over Big in Brasilia." I ask unanimous consent that that be inserted into the RECORD. I would be glad to share it with the Senator from Maryland.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 24, 1982]

OUR MAN FROM ALASKA GOES OVER BIG IN BRASILIA

(By Warren Hoge)

RIO DE JANEIRO, November 23.—When Langhorne Anthony Motley was named the United States Ambassador to Brazil a year ago, a lot of people grumbled.

"I know, I was one of them," said Lowell C. Kilday, director of the State Department's Office of Brazilian Affairs in Washington. "A lot of eyebrows were raised. We looked at Brazil, the most important country in Latin America, and thought, 'What's going on around here sending a guy like that?'"

In Brasilia, the outgoing Ambassador, Robert M. Sayre, was asked by the Federal Reserve Board head, Paul A. Volcker, then visiting Brazil, who his successor would be.

"Some real estate agent from Alaska," was the acid response, according to two other people who participated in the conversation.

THE COMPLAINTS ARE QUALIFIED

A land developer, Republican Party stalwart and former Air Force officer, Mr. Motley came here from Anchorage as one of the host of political appointees with which the Reagan Administration has filled its ambassadorial ranks—to the distress of many career diplomats like Mr. Sayre. The American Foreign Service Association says that one of every three such appointments

have been going to noncareer people under President Reagan after the Carter Administration had succeeded in reducing the number to one in every four.

But today the complaining in State Department corridors over the phenomenon carries a conversational asterisk exempting Mr. Motley. In a year he has gained extraordinary access to the highest levels of the Brazilian Government, earned the high regard of other ambassadors in Brasilia, won over the most traditional diplomats in his own embassy and gained the singular tribute of being hailed as "our" Ambassador by a major Brazilian newspaper.

He played a principal role in setting up President Reagan's coming trip here, dealing directly with Brazil's president, Jaoa Baptista Figueiredo, by White House telephone while the Brazilian leader was campaigning in interior cities for candidates in elections held Nov. 15. If the two Presidents follow the practice of their first meeting in Washington in May, Mr. Motley will be doing the translating when they get together in Brasilia Dec. 1.

BRAZILIANS BACKGROUND A HELP

Mr. Motley has brought to his assignment one great advantage. Born and raised in Rio de Janeiro, he speaks fluent Portuguese down to the accompanying gestures and unprintable expressions. "A lot of Brazilian editors have told me they have to clean up his interviews," an embassy press officer said.

*** He has driven his pickup out to Mr. Figueiredo's farm on a number of occasions for drinks with the President himself or barbecue lunches with the presidential palace "group" that runs the country.

State Department officials said the embassy reporting from Brazil had grown far more informed and other ambassadors in Brasilia have been making it their habit to drop in on Mr. Motley for briefings before they take their home-leave trips. "When Motley first came, I wasn't prepared to be impressed," said one. "Who is this Republican businessman, I thought. But I've grown to have a lot of respect for him."

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS

Mr. Motley has become a familiar figure in Brazilian public life because of his willingness to talk to the press and to be interviewed on television. He earned the admiring editorial in São Paulo's *Jornal da Tarde* after making speeches to business and banking groups in the United States arguing that Brazil's economy was being unjustly compared to those of Mexico and Argentina. The newspaper complimented Mr. Motley for doing a job that it said should have been expected from Brazil's own Ambassador in Washington, Antonio Azeredo da Silveira.***

The son of a former head of the American Chamber of Commerce in Rio, Mr. Motley has gotten high marks from the sizable American business colony for his combative response to Brazilian charges that United States protectionism is crippling the economy here. "He really tells it like it is and we appreciated that," said Joseph W. O'Neill, president of the American Chamber of Commerce in São Paulo.

Mr. Motley commonly points out that millions of Americans wear Brazilian shoes and challenges critics to find any Brazilians in American footwear. He also notes that so many Bandeirante aircraft have been sold to American commuter airlines that there are now more Americans than Brazilians flying in such planes.

Forty-four years old and boyish-looking, he dresses in loafers and loose-fitting suits and often walks around with his hands thrust into his trouser pockets. It has not been uncommon for people to ask him where the Ambassador is.

10 YEARS IN THE AIR FORCE

Known as Tony, he said that even his mother never called him Langhorne. She is half-Brazilian and half-British and still lives in Rio. His father, an executive with Atlantic Refining in Rio, died in 1950 in a plane crash.

Mr. Motley lived in Rio until leaving for college at the Citadel in Charleston, S.C., when he was 17. He spent the 10 years after graduation in the Air Force before retiring to civilian life and helping create the largest real estate company in Alaska.

He served for two years as the state's Secretary of Commerce and Economic Development and then spent four years lobbying in Washington against environmental groups in the Alaska lands debate. He has worked closely with the Alaskan Senators, Ted Stevens and Frank H. Murkowski, each a Republican. In 1978 he and Senator Stevens were the only survivors of a plane crash in Anchorage that took five lives. He is outgoing and informal and works a room like a politician. "I've never seen a political appointee who got to know so many people so fast," said Mr. Kilday.

He plays soccer with the handymen and gardeners and opens his residence pool on weekends to embassy staffers who live in Brasilia's faceless "superquadra" apartment buildings. For July 4 this year, he gave a party for more than 2,000 people at his house with American beer and baked beans, parachute jumps, square dancing and treasure hunts. "He had everyone there from Cabinet officers to janitors," one Embassy staffer said.

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator wanted to know the source. I would like to insert into the RECORD immediately following that article an editorial in the New York Times dated July 3, 1989, entitled "Trivializing Ambassadors," in which the New York Times states, "No one argues that the country would be better served if all ambassadors were professional diplomats." I have not argued that here today, nor should campaign contributors be automatically excluded. They can do a good job, depending on their political instinct, stature, and experience.

I have also conceded that point here today. This editorial does go on to call for the rejection of Mr. Zappala, and it states: "It would be wise for the President to reconsider such nominees, and if not, permissible, indeed salutary, for the Senate to reject them." I ask that that editorial in full be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 3, 1989]

TRIVIALIZING AMBASSADORS

Presidents and Congress have a habit of rewarding fat cats and cronies with foreign embassies, of treating many ambassadorial appointments as if they don't much matter in representing American interests and

values. But they do matter, sometimes critically.

President Bush has not improved on the tradition, to judge by his nominations to Spain, Australia and New Zealand. The only distinction visible in his proposed Ambassador to Madrid, Joseph Zappala, a Florida developer, is a distinctively large contribution to the Republican Party, reportedly \$126,000. Ditto for another Florida businessman, Melvin Sembler (\$127,000), nominated to Canberra. And the choice for Wellington is Della Newman, a Seattle broker who managed Mr. Bush's state campaign.

Dispatching a lightweight or inexperienced envoy sends a message of unconcern verging on contempt. That's why a move by Senator Paul Sarbanes deserves support. The Maryland Democrat has forced the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to put off considering this trio until mid-July, giving the Senate more time to weigh the nominees' qualifications—and for all concerned to think harder about the importance of ambassadors.

No one argues that the country would be better served if all ambassadors were professional diplomats. That would have meant losing such star noncareer performers as Mike Mansfield, Averell Harriman, David Bruce and Edwin Reischauer, to name a few. Nor should campaign contributors be automatically excluded. They can do a good job, depending on their political instincts, stature and experience. Moreover, foreign service officers can make feeble ambassadors, given to inertia, caution and fixation with form.

Presidents need considerable latitude in selecting what are in part personal representatives. The Constitution spells out their right to do so, subject to senatorial consent. It clearly stretches the legislative role to withhold or delay confirmation if a Senator objects to a nominee on ideological grounds—an abuse repeatedly and indefensibly indulged by Senator Jesse Helms.

Yet advice and consent does mean something: the Senate has an obligation to hold Presidential nominees to rudimentary standards of competence. Senator Sarbanes has reasons to be troubled when Mr. Sembler, the nominee for Australia, supplies this written answer to a question about his qualification: "I have been known as a coalition-builder, able to organize my peers to action in support of worthy civic, charitable and political causes."

Nearly identical language was used by whoever answered the same written question for Mr. Zappala, the nominee for Spain, treating both the Senate and an important capital with the same manipulative cynicism.

Those old European capitals, with large embassy staffs and calm relations, have long offered safe places to reward fat cats. That's much less true today. Change now buffets Western and Eastern Europe. Consider Italy, where only a year ago and at some political cost, a centrist coalition government agreed to accept U.S. airbases soon to be closed by a Socialist government in Spain. Yet Mr. Bush's choice for Rome is Peter Secchia, manager of his Michigan campaign, whose innocence in diplomacy seems complete.

Does it repay Italy's fidelity, or soothe Spain's nationalism, for the United States to send them envoys conspicuously unequipped by experience or knowledge? It would be wise for the President to reconsider such nominees; and if not, permissible,

indeed salutary, for the Senate to reject them.

Mr. SARBANES. Second, I say to the Senator from Arizona—because I am prompted to make these very quick remarks about two statements he made—one, to bracket Joseph Zappala with Ellsworth Bunker, as he did, is to make a comparison I think he may some day regret. I am perfectly happy to hold Joseph Zappala to that standard, if he should in fact succeed in going to Madrid, and I am prepared at any time in the future to engage in a debate with my colleague from Arizona with respect to Mr. Zappala and his performance in Spain, as compared to Ellsworth Bunker.

I know the Senator wants to make a point here to get Joseph Zappala over a certain threshold, but it does seem to me that it is overreaching to bracket him with one of the most effective and skillful persons who has ever represented us in the diplomatic field, Ellsworth Bunker.

I am surprised you do not have David K. Bruce in the same bracket.

Finally, the Senator makes a great deal of giving the President sort of *carte blanche*. He said at one point that if the President is foolish and sends foolish nominees, it is the President who pays for it. But it is the United States that pays, I submit to the Senator, and the foolishness is not only the President's in nominating them but it may well be the Senate's in confirming them, and that is the point I am trying to assert here today.

Our responsibility is not simply a passthrough rubber stamp responsibility. If the President makes a foolish nomination it seems to me we have some role in trying to prevent it from happening. And if it should happen, I do not agree with the Senator's observation that it is the President who pays the price. It is the United States and all the American people who pay the price of having a representative who is really not up to handling the job.

Mr. DECONCINI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island yields to the Senator from Arizona for a statement without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I concede the Senator from Maryland makes a good point, that the United States suffers as well as the President. I am glad he made that clarification.

My point is with Ellsworth Bunker that when he was brought before the Senate and nominated to be the Ambassador to Brazil, he was a sugar re-

finer with no experience whatsoever. People questioned Mr. Bunker, as people have questioned Mr. Zappala. I do not know if he will match that good record. But 35 years proved that Mr. Bunker, coming from no experience at all, turned out to be one of our great Ambassadors.

It seems to me that anybody who is presented here with qualifications such as Mr. Zappala's, which are similar to those of Mr. Bunker, ought to have the benefit of the doubt and be approved.

I pointed out in the New York Times article about Mr. Motley that precedes the one the Senator from Maryland put in the RECORD that he came also from the private sector with no experience and went on to be appointed as Ambassador to Brazil.

My point, Mr. President, is simply this: Where are you going to get qualified people? You cannot get them all from Foggy Bottom, and I do not think we want them all from there. We want people who are in business and who have been successful or are in the environmental area or in the legal profession who have proven success in whatever profession you may choose. They are bound to be associated closely with the President or they would not be nominated. Is there anything wrong in that? I do not think so. I think that is what this process is all about.

I thank my friend from Rhode Island for yielding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with regret that I state my own intention to vote against the nomination of Mr. Joseph Zappala to be the Ambassador to Spain. My decision to oppose this nominee was not taken lightly. It is rare that I oppose the President's choices for ambassadorships. Further, my vote should not be taken as a judgment on Mr. Zappala's character. It is not. In fact, I am sure he is a man of fine character and intelligence. He is just not qualified for this particular job.

Rather, my vote is based on the unique and vital constitutional responsibilities of the Senate in approving Presidential appointments. In essence, the Senate is a guardian, charged with passing judgment on the qualifications of individuals for the positions for which they have been appointed.

In section 304 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, the following standards are set for the appointment of Ambassadors:

An individual appointed or assigned to be a chief of mission should possess clearly demonstrated competence to perform the duties of a chief of mission, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a useful knowledge of the principal language or dialect of the country in which the individual is to serve, and knowledge and understand-

ing of the history, the culture, the economic and political institutions and the interests of that country and its people.

The act goes on to state that,

Contributions to political campaigns should not be a factor in the appointment of an individual as a chief of mission.

Regrettably, when these standards are applied to Mr. Zappala, I am forced to conclude that the nominee does not possess the qualifications outlined in the Foreign Service Act. An examination of the nominee's résumé reveals not one instance of experience in dealing with foreign governments. Nor is there any indication that prior to his nomination, Mr. Zappala had displayed an interest in the people, the politics, or the history of Spain. Indeed, a review of the nominee's "Certification of Demonstrated Competence"—a document submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee describing a nominee's qualifications for the position to which they have been appointed—does not mention a single one of the criteria outlined in the Foreign Service Act.

What then were the reasons for his nomination? In looking at the record, I am forced to conclude that the main reason for Mr. Zappala's nomination was his fundraising and financial contributions to the past political campaign. Sadly, this view, too, is borne out in the nominee's "Certification of Demonstrated Competence." Approximately one-half of the document is devoted to Mr. Zappala's fundraising activities on behalf of the President. In this regard I do not recall when an ambassadorial nominee's financial contributions were so crassly and openly given as reasons for his appointment.

Mr. President, I realize that there have been political appointees in the past and that there will be political appointees in the future. Indeed, there is a litany of individuals who, although not career Foreign Service Officers, have served this country with the greatest of distinction as Ambassadors of the United States. One has only to think of former Senator Mansfield in Tokyo, Arthur Burns, in Bonn, and Averell Harriman in Moscow to realize that there is and must be a place for noncareer diplomats to serve as ambassadors. Equally clear, however, is the fact that these men brought to their ambassadorships experience applicable to the job, experience that with their ability enabled them to serve as ambassadors of distinction.

Unfortunately, Mr. Zappala does not bring these types of qualifications to the Senate. If he did, I would be one of the first to voice my support for his nomination.

Instead this nominee appears to have been chosen for his fundraising and financial contributions in the past political campaign.

Mr. President, the Senate was given its responsibility of advising and consenting to ambassadorial nominations precisely to prevent this type of favoritism from occurring. If it is to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities, the Senate has an obligation to oppose this nominee.

In making these remarks, I am conscious of the fact I believe I am the only Senator who has been a career diplomat, so I am perhaps particularly sensitive to the qualifications that are needed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator yields the floor.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES].

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, as I understand it, when he was speaking earlier, the Senator from Minnesota listed various ambassadors who had served in Spain as political ambassadors. If the Senator will yield for a question, is that correct?

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. And included in that list, as I recall, there were some eight ambassadors, ending with Peter Flanigan.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. That is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would like to comment on that. First of all, since 1975 all our ambassadors to Spain have been career people and, as I indicated in my opening statement, have been amongst the most distinguished in the career service.

Second, Peter Flanigan never made it to Spain as an ambassador. He was nominated in the late summer of 1974. His nomination ran into serious difficulty in the Senate and was withdrawn on November 16, 1974.

The reason that nomination ran into trouble—and then subsequently we got the first of these career appointees—was that Herbert Kalmbach, who was President Nixon's private attorney, testified at the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry in 1974 that Peter Flanigan brokered ambassadorships in return for massive contributions to the 1972 Nixon Presidential campaign. Flanigan himself acknowledged to Kalmbach that a potential ambassadorial nominee, Dr. Ruth B. Farkas, was a good prospect for solicitation. According to Kalmbach, Flanigan advised him to contact Dr. Farkas, since she was interested in giving \$250,000 for Costa Rica. Dr. Farkas, Kalmbach reported, thought Costa Rica not worth that much. By contributing \$300,000, she eventually got herself named Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Kalmbach later went to jail. He pleaded guilty for promising an ambassadorship for campaign contributions and was sentenced to a jail term of from 6 to 18 months and ordered to pay a \$10,000 fine.

So citing Flanigan is not relevant here because, first of all, he never went as Ambassador to Spain although he was nominated to be Ambassador to Spain. And the reason he did not go was his involvement with Kalmbach, who disclosed that he had been the conduit between contributors and the White House staff in charge of selecting political appointees. And it was in the aftermath of these disclosures that the United States then sent a career ambassador to Spain, and has since sent a career ambassador each subsequent time that the post has been filled.

The shift to a career ambassador in 1975 also coincided with Spain's emergence from the Franco dictatorship into a democratic country. Obviously, it seems to me it was a recognition on the part of our administration of the need to have an able and experienced ambassador on the scene as Spain went through the extraordinary transition to democracy.

And Spain still, while it has moved through the political transition, is now involved very much in an economic transition.

So I only make the point to my colleague that while it is true there were a series of political nominees during the period when Franco was in control in Spain and we were treating that nation as something of, apparently, a political throwaway, that issue was turned into a crisis, by the controversy surrounding the Flanigan nomination. And although my colleague listed Flanigan as an Ambassador to Spain he never made it; he was nominated but not approved here, and the nomination was withdrawn.

At the same time the crisis was intensified by the changes taking place in Spain. Spain's role today is a critically important one, and I think this underscores the significance of the nomination.

Mr. President, I would like to bring up to date the record that appears on page 12 of the committee report, to show the percentage of ambassadorial nominations made by this administration thus far into its term as compared with nominations made by preceding administrations. The table in the committee report on page 12 shows figures for the first 7 months. Revised through September the figures show that of the 58 nominations which President Bush has made, 36 of them political, for 62 percent, and 22 are career.

Let me just run through the other administrations. President Kennedy, in the first 9 months of 1961, made 64 nominations. Of those, 39 were career, 25 political, or 61 percent career.

President Johnson, in the first 9 months of 1965, made 39 nominations, 28 of them career, 11 political; in other words, 72 percent career.

President Nixon, in the first 9 months of 1969, made 70 nominations, 44 career, 26 political; in other words, 63 percent career.

President Nixon, in the first 9 months of 1973, after his reelection, made 36 nominations, 32 career, 13 political; in other words, 64 percent career.

President Carter, in the first 9 months of 1977, made 59 nominations, 36 career, 23 political, in other words, 61 percent career.

President Reagan, in the first 9 months of 1981, 57 nominations, 35 career, 22 political; in other words, 61 percent career.

President Reagan, in the first 9 months after his second election, made 37 nominations, 27 career, 11 political.

Now all of these Presidents—Kennedy through Reagan—in the first 9 months of their administrations, in no instance appointed less than 61 percent career, and in one instance went as high as 72 percent career. Political appointments, therefore, ranged between 28 and 39 percent.

President Bush, in the first 9 months of his administration, made 58 country nominations, which actually compares roughly with the figures made by others. Actually, it is in excess, in some instances, with the second term; but in the first term, 58; Reagan, 57; Carter, 59; Nixon, his first term, 70; Kennedy, 64. So it is in the same range in terms of the number of nominations.

The striking difference is that of the 58 nominations for country ambassadors, only 22 of President Bush's nominations have been from the career service. Only 22. In other words, 38 percent. The lowest previous percent of all Presidents cited, was 61 percent career. In this administration, 36 of them have been political, or 62 percent. So we have just the reverse, a precise flip in the numbers of political versus career nominations compared with all the previous Presidents beginning with Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, and Reagan. That is a pretty dramatic shift.

The other issue we have to address, of course, is the qualifications and experience of the political appointees who have been named.

I want to make just a couple of observations on what some of my colleagues have said, particularly my distinguished friends from Minnesota and from Florida.

First of all, there is an effort, I think, to equate the nomination of an ambassador to a political career. We are given a comparison between someone being picked for ambassador and someone who gets elected to the U.S. Senate. But the basis of choice is very different. We run and are chosen by the people. We run against an opponent, so we have the basis of that com-

parison. And one can cite in a campaign any or none of a whole host of factors why we ought to come to the Senate or not come to the Senate. I am struck by the effort, in effect, to politicize this ambassadorial choice.

What are we telling the people in the career service? I think one of the most upsetting aspects of some of what has been said in the debate today is the way it denigrates the career service. We have young men and women across the country who take tests to get into the career service. They are encouraged to consider this a career. They are evaluated as they move through their career. They are sent to language school in order to learn languages. They go through an intense training period to be able to handle the complexities of the job. They have a variety of experiences out in the field and here at home.

Under modern circumstances they subject themselves to great risks. More ambassadors since the Korean war have lost their lives than admirals and generals. Fortunately, the number is not large. But, nevertheless, I think it is important to keep that in mind. Under current circumstances, they take extraordinary risks in order to serve the country.

We tell these people: You have to do a good job. You have to perform. You have to deliver in these positions. You should learn languages. You should develop experience and expertise.

Now some are belittling that effort. But the fact of the matter is that the only reason we can even contemplate sending inexperienced political ambassadors abroad without expecting catastrophe is that we can count on career people in the embassy to shepherd them through their ambassadorship.

I submit that if we start sending a message to the career people that they are never going to become ambassadors, that it does not really matter how well they do their job and serve their country it is going to be harder to attract and hold good people. The quality of the career service will run down, the people we will have there to back up political ambassadors will diminish in quality, and the whole country will pay a very high price for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the American Foreign Service Association called, "Does the State Department Respect Ambassadors?"; and an article commenting about a talk by Ambassador Elliott Richardson entitled "Richardson Rewards Frustrations of the Foreign Service."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Foreign Service Journal, September 1989]

RICHARDSON: REWARDS, FRUSTRATIONS OF FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Richard S. Thompson, Professional Issues Coordinator)

Ambassador Elliot L. Richardson talked to a large crowd in the Foreign Service Club June 15 on "The Rewards and Frustrations of Public Service: the Case of the Foreign Service." His remarks were based on his seven years with the Department of State and his current service as a member of the National Commission on the Public Service (the Volcker Commission), which recently issued its report on "Rebuilding the Public Service."

Richardson first stressed that the Foreign Service offers important rewards: the intrinsic satisfaction of devoting oneself to the interests of the United States, and interesting and challenging work.

Frustrations, however, are mounting throughout the government, fed by declining esteem and presidential campaigning against Washington. The problem of compensation is deeper than is generally realized. In the case of the Foreign Service, Richardson asserted, the problem of the career ladder and opportunities for those of demonstrated ability is especially serious with no counterpart elsewhere in government. The possibility of becoming an ambassador, assistant secretary, or deputy assistant secretary is a legitimate goal and the fluctuating availability of such assignments owing to political appointments is a demoralizing factor. The National Commission suggests not more than 30 percent of ambassadors be non-career.

Another problem is the quality of those chosen, since the abilities of many political appointees "are not obvious." It is an illusion that modern telecommunications have reduced the role of the ambassador and country team. In fact, the increased complexity of foreign affairs means that issues that would have gone to the secretary of state in the past must now be dealt with by the country director or the embassy. In addition, the means available to achieve goals are dwindling, so Foreign Service personnel must be more clever and have a clear idea of what their goals are. Competition with representatives of other countries is more intense, so the Service needs better people—better trained and better compensated. Richardson concluded by noting the report of the National Commission on the Public Service advanced recommendations to improve awareness of the importance of public service and to better its efficiency. Vigorous follow-up action is underway to enlist support for these recommendations.

At Richardson's request, the commission's executive director, the Honorable Bruce Laingen, added a few words stressing the common goals of the Foreign Service and the Civil Service in building esteem for government service and attracting able young people.

In the question and answer session Richardson indicated he expected action on the issue of pay for senior employees before the end of this Congress. He believed the current emphasis on ethics could establish a higher standard, with the new Foley leadership in the House a positive factor. He also noted that in business circles he argues the need for able people in government; without them, problems get worse and government intervention increases, decreasing the scope for private initiative. The savings and loan crisis was a good example, he said.

Richardson commented that a president has mixed motives in making ambassadorial appointments. He wants to be successful, and knows he needs good people. The president should have an attitude of "trusteeship," toward the Foreign Service as a long-term asset, as Richardson told Secretary Baker. A president has wide discretion to establish a certain ratio of political ambassadors and hold to it.

[From the Foreign Service Journal, September 1989]

DOES THE STATE DEPARTMENT RESPECT AMBASSADORS?

(By Charles A. Schmitz, State Vice President)

The White House liaison staff in the office of the under secretary for management is charged with preparing the "certificates of competency" for non-career candidates to be U.S. ambassadors. The certificate is supposed to tell the Senate Foreign Relations Committee why the candidate has a "clearly demonstrated competence" to perform the duties "of the position in which he or she is to serve."

In some recent cases, the certificates say things like: "Mr. X is a member of the Republican National Committee's Team 100" [i.e., donated at least \$100,000 to the committee]; and "Mr. X's impressive business background in real estate combined with his civic activities qualify him as an excellent candidate for U.S. ambassador to Y."

By producing such a certificate the White House liaison staff in the State Department manages to 1) demean the functions of a U.S. ambassador, 2) insult countries friendly to the U.S., and 3) violate U.S. law. That kind of triple score is usually associated with hostile, third world governments, not with our State Department.

The law is violated because the Foreign Service Act specifies what should be in the certificate of competency and what should not be there. What should be there is the required evidence that the candidate can do the job (e.g., maybe knows the country, speaks some of the language, understands the culture and traditions, grasps the relationships between that country and the United States, knows how to run something like an embassy, knows something about international relations, or maybe even something about the business of government).

What should not be there is recitation of political contributions. The Foreign Service Act is crystal clear in stating that political contributions should not be a factor in ambassadorial nominations.

The insult to friendly countries comes when the people of the country to which the candidate is to be sent as U.S. ambassador read the certification reported in their own newspapers, and realize that the U.S. thinks so little of their country that experience in American real estate is deemed sufficient to conduct the necessary state business. An important foreign newspaper recently said, "Relations between—and the U.S. are ill served by Washington appointing ambassadors to—who have no special insight into the workings and the importance of our alliance, the business of government or international relations."

The function of the U.S. ambassador is mightily demeaned by the State Department's certification that success in ordinary businesses demonstrates "excellent" qualifications to be an ambassador. Our argument is not with business people: many of them have made fine ambassadors; but those

people had other fine qualities and related experience as well. Current certifications make it look as though success in business and a political contribution is all that is necessary.

If the State Department itself has no great respect for ambassadors, what must it think of the rest of us in the Foreign Service?

AFSA has a responsibility to the Foreign Service to help build a sense of pride in the foreign affairs profession. State Department management apparently does not share this sense of responsibility. It ought to.

In the meantime, if management could start complying with the Foreign Service Act, AFSA, the Senate, the American people, and U.S. foreign friends and allies all would very much appreciate it.

Mr. SARBANES. I might note in that article Elliot Richardson points out that the National Commission on the Public Service, the Volcker Commission, which has been studying the broad problem of how to attract and hold able people in Government service and recently issued a report entitled, "Rebuilding of the Public Service," points out that the problem of the career ladder and opportunities for those of demonstrated ability is especially serious with no counterpart elsewhere in Government. The possibility of becoming an ambassador, assistant secretary or deputy assistant secretary is a legitimate goal and the fluctuating availability of such assignments to political appointments is a demoralizing factor.

The National Commission suggests that not more than 30 percent of ambassadors be noncareer; that is, National Commission on the Public Service chaired by Paul Volcker with a very broad membership. I think it is important to underscore their conclusions.

We have all these people in the Foreign Service committed to serving their country, doing their best to meet high standards, yes, in effect, they are being told here today: It does not really matter, people can come in from the outside with no ostensible qualifications for the job and have no problem handling it.

Then, the first order of business once they get nominated is to go searching for a bright, able, and dedicated deputy chief of mission to back them up so that they do not make a major mistake.

The final point I would make is, I am really struck by the assertion that if you know Italian, you virtually know Spanish.

I do not know of any academic dean in the country who would simply pass a student through a Spanish course on the strength of that student having passed through the Italian course. It is true that there is some overlap, and the majority, in its report, tries to make a lot of it because they are related romance languages.

Nevertheless, I say again that I know of no academic program in this

country that takes proficiency in Italian and simply equates it with proficiency in Spanish.

In the last analysis, it all comes back to how well will the Nation be served; how well will our interests be protected. I want, in effect, to pinpoint the differences.

No one is arguing that all Ambassadors should be from the career service. I do argue, however, that a significant percentage should be from the career service because I think otherwise we are going to demoralize the career service.

I think we all accept the possibility of bringing people in from outside of the career service. We have had some distinguished Ambassadors drawn in that way.

But their records, I think, have warranted their selection. The very people who have been named here, and names like Mansfield, Arthur Burns, David Bruce, Averell Harriman, Ed Reichauer and so on have been tossed around, constitute a very select list. In each of those instances, one could look at the record and see in it demonstrable ability and experience and qualifications to serve abroad.

What is happening too frequently with appointments by this administration is that as one looks through the record, it is clear that the reason for the nomination is large campaign contributions. In fact, Secretary Mosbacher, who is in charge of the political giving, has been quite blunt in admitting it. He complained back in February that these people have given a lot of money to the campaign and are not getting their just rewards including ambassadorships. It is to that kind of nomination that I think the Senate should now hold up its hand and say, this practice must stop.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of editorials which have appeared around the country with respect to this issue and this nomination be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1989]
EX-FINANCE CHAIRMAN COMPLAINS FEW JOBS
GO TO BUSH FUND-RAISERS
(By Richard L. Berke)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—Robert A. Mosbacher Sr., the Commerce Secretary who was finance chairman of President Bush's campaign, says he is distressed that more campaign fundraisers have not been rewarded with political appointments.

He blamed officials in the Administration, but not Mr. Bush himself, for favoring political operatives over fundraisers for posts at all levels of Government.

"There's this perception in Washington and politics, and some degree in Government," he said in an interview this weekend, "that fund-raisers and fund-givers are nice, interesting people to be sort of patted on the head when you need them and ignored the rest of the time because they don't really understand the process."

CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION

"We're not trying to foist off any second-grade dummies," he said. "In truth; they are the most successful people in their communities."

Some critics counter that the fundraisers are doing well in getting appointments. In fact, some of them derided the Administration for being partial to fund-raisers.

Mr. Mosbacher said in the interview that he planned to bring the issue to the attention of White House personnel officials and that he hoped to speak directly to Mr. Bush about it.

The Commerce Secretary, who ran the Bush fund-raising effort in the primaries and the Republican Party's drive to raise millions of dollars from wealthy donors, said there were "several hundred" fund-raisers who deserved appointments to ambassadorships, sub-Cabinet posts or lower-level jobs on commissions who were being neglected. The campaign had a national finance board of some 350 people in the primaries, and for the general election, 249 individuals and corporations gave at least \$100,000 apiece to the Republican Party.

"Quite a high percentage of those who have been helpful haven't gotten anything—at last 50 percent," Mr. Mosbacher said.

TOP JOBS FOR MANY

More than a dozen people who gave at least \$100,000 to the Republican Party last year, or helped solicit millions of dollars more for Mr. Bush, are being tapped for jobs as ambassadors or as policy makers at sub-Cabinet levels.

In addition, what officials describe as a "must be placed" list is circulating in the Administration, with the names of 50 major donors who want jobs for themselves or their relatives. Many are expected to be named to part-time posts on Presidential boards and commissions.

Presidents of both parties have long rewarded their political loyalists with plum appointments. Because of changes in the Federal campaign finance law, which were made after the Watergate scandal, people no longer can give directly to a Presidential candidate in the general election. But they can give to a political party.

"There is definitely a perception problem when ambassadors and other high people are large contributors," said David M. Dorsen, a lawyer here who was assistant chief counsel in charge of campaign finance for the Senate Watergate committee.

"TERRIBLE WAY TO DO BUSINESS"

Fred Wertheimer, president of Common Cause, a public affairs lobby group, said the appointment of fundraisers was "a terrible way to do business," and he called on the Senate committees considering those appointments to "conduct rigorous inquiries about whether money played any role in the appointments."

But determining how much a donation played into an appointment would be a complicated, if not impossible undertaking.

"What really matters to George Bush is not the number of zeros after a figure in a ledger book, but the loyalty and commitment shown by a person, be it as a fundraiser or a doorbell ringer," said Charles G. Untermeyer, the White House personnel director.

Bruce S. Gelb conceded, though, that had he not helped raise \$3 million for Mr. Bush's campaign last year, he might not have been nominated to head the United

States Information Agency. "I may have been selected to be dog catcher," he said.

Beyond his fund-raising prowess, Mr. Gelb, who is leaving his job as vice chairman of Bristol-Myers Company in New York, contended that other factors helped him win the prestigious post: his loyalty to Mr. Bush for decades and his business acumen.

LOYALTY TO BUSH

"If you look at 10 really outstanding people and they all have great track records and you find one that has been a longtime fund-raiser, that person clearly has a real advantage," he said. "But if the person cannot represent George Bush in the way he wants to be represented, the person could give all the money in the world and it would not happen."

In the campaign, only a small minority of donors were blatant enough to say they expected an Administration post, Bush aides said. "Some people at the very beginning said, 'I'm involved in this because I want this,'" said a Republican official who asked not to be named. "The response back was, 'It's great to have you on board but there is no quid pro quo.'"

Many of the most diligent fund-raisers were friends who have known Mr. Bush for decades. Mr. Mosbacher, for instance, has known the President for 30 years. He, in turn, is doing his part to place his fund-raisers.

Mr. Mosbacher is expected to select Michael P. Galvin, a Chicago lawyer and a top Bush fund-raiser, to the highly sought post of Assistant Secretary for Exports. And officials said Mr. Mosbacher plans to pick Rockwell A. Schnabel, a major donor who is now Ambassador to Finland, to another sought after job: Under Secretary of Commerce for Trade and Tourism, a post that involves much travel and few difficult policy demands.

Another major fund-raiser, Frederick M. Bush, who is no relation to the President, worked for Mr. Bush for 10 years in many fund-raising capacities, most recently as deputy finance chairman. He has been named Ambassador to Luxembourg.

SOME OF THE APPOINTMENTS

Other \$100,000 contributors and Bush fund-raisers who have been named to important posts include Walter J.P. Curely Jr., a former Ambassador to Ireland, as Ambassador to France; Joseph Zappala, a land developer from Tampa, Fla., as Ambassador to Spain; Melvin F. Sembler, another Florida developer who held that state's first fund-raising event for Mr. Bush, as Ambassador to Australia, and Henry E. Catto Jr., a longtime Republican contributor who has previously served in Government, as Ambassador to Britain.

Several other appointments of top contributors are in the works, including Joseph B. Gildenhorn, a Washington real estate executive who may be tapped for Ambassador to Switzerland, and Eric Javits, a New York Lawyer and nephew of the late Senator Jacob Javits, who is a leading contender for Ambassador to Venezuela.

Some big donors were not interested in appointments, particularly those in business who could not disentangle themselves from their companies or were not willing to have their finances scrutinized.

Even so, as Mr. Mosbacher emphasized, there are more donors interested in jobs than there are jobs available.

In one case, Republican officials are working behind the scenes to try to find a post

for Joy A. Silverman of Manhattan, a diligent fund-raiser who was said to be disappointed not to be named Ambassador to Luxembourg. "By all standards she deserves something," Mr. Mosbacher said. "She raised a lot of money, worked hard."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 23, 1989]

UTERMAYER: LOYALTY WINS AMBASSADORSHIPS

(By Judith Havemann)

Presidential personnel director Chase Utermeyer told the American Foreign Service Association yesterday that it was loyalty, not money, that enabled some large political contributors to receive ambassadorships in the Bush administration.

Ambassadorial nominees, he said, were selected for competence, loyalty and support over long periods of time. "Loyalty," he said, "can be [shown by] money . . . long service and friendship over many years."

For some people, "the degree of support was financial . . . Wealth does not serve as a disqualification for public office," he said.

The members of the professional organization for Foreign Service officers sat diplomatically as Utermeyer defended President Bush's appointments, some of which have come under strong attack by Senate Democrats as unqualified.

Speaking at an association lunch here, Utermeyer said not all the political ambassadors the White House has nominated were wealthy donors and not all loyal Bush campaign workers got jobs.

"Loyal people are pounding the bricks cursing the name of Chase Utermeyer," he said.

He said that his use of the word "loyalty" to describe the special characteristics of the political nominees does not reflect in any way on the loyalty of career Foreign Service officers.

In making political appointments, he said, "you go with the people who are your own . . . Loyalty given is loyalty returned."

Bush intends to "increase the number, weight and magnitude of the posts" to which he plans to name Foreign Service officers, Utermeyer said.

While most of the ambassadorial nominations Bush has sent to the Senate are non-career, Utermeyer said the Bush administration's overall record on appointments of career Foreign Service officers is much better.

He said the Bush administration has kept all of President Ronald Reagan's career ambassadors in place, raising them to 65 percent of the total.

Between 60 percent and 62 percent of the ambassadorial posts under Reagan were held by career Foreign Service officers, he said. Bush wants to increase the percentage to 66 percent.

"We don't want to be judged on the numbers, although we look reasonably good here and we will get better," he said. He said that the use of political appointments makes it possible to increase the percentage of women and minorities in ambassadorships.

He said there are only six female career ambassadors out of 145 and that 10 of Bush's non-career nominees are women.

A member of the audience complained that four of five black ambassadors are in "tiny African countries." Utermeyer responded that Bush had named a black ambassador to Argentina, a prized post.

Another questioner asked whether the Bush administration would be as willing to make non-military appointments to military

billets as it is to make non-career appointments to diplomatic posts.

An increasing number of people have been named to civilian positions at DOD [the Department of Defense] without military experience . . . there has been no war for 20 years," Utermeyer said. "Regrettably, they are not people who start out with the basics, who know what the ranks mean. . . ."

The Foreign Service Association, which is the bargaining agent as well as professional group for Foreign Service officers, received Utermeyer politely. Association members praised his speech, his delivery, his presence and his courage but appeared to reject his message.

"He presented his arguments well," association President Theodore S. Wilkinson said. "I don't agree with him."

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 18, 1989]

EMBASSIES FOR SALE

Senator Paul S. Sarbanes has performed a public service in his guerrilla warfare against confirmation of some of the least qualified people nominated to sensitive ambassadorships.

The Maryland Democrat has suggested auctioning ambassadorships so that at least the money goes to the U.S. Treasury instead of to campaign funds. He has pointed fingers at nominees who penned identical bromides in stating their qualifications. He has ridden point for the more judiciously phrased complaints of the American Foreign Service Association. He has ridiculed State Department tongue-in-cheek certification of certain presidential nominees as qualified who aren't. Above all, Senator Sarbanes used his power as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to delay confirmation of nominations until public debate can focus on them.

These are Joseph Zappala, a Florida developer and major Bush campaign fund-raiser, as ambassador to Spain; Melvin Sembler, another one, as ambassador to Australia; and Della Newman, a Seattle real estate broker and fund-raiser, as ambassador to New Zealand. These people have no known qualifications other than donations above \$100,000, and can do the national interest harm in Spain, which is pushing out U.S. bases; in Australia, which welcomes U.S. nuclear ships and New Zealand, which doesn't. Each of those countries, and U.S. interests in each, deserve better.

One of this ilk who got through is Peter Secchia, a Michigan millionaire known principally for crudity of speech, who has presented his credentials as ambassador to Italy. The Italian press and left are having a field day. There is a pattern here. Look at the choice of the hapless one-term Nevada senator, Chic Hecht, confirmed to be ambassador to the Bahamas, supposedly qualified by his love of golf and interest in casinos.

What President Bush and Secretary of State James A. Baker III seem to be saying is that ambassadors don't matter, the bureaucracy can do the job. But such appointments insult the countries and diminish U.S. influence.

Politically appointed ambassadors can do excellent work. All modern administrations have sinned in selling some embassies. The Bush administration is overdoing it. The Foreign Service Act of 1980 stipulates that "contributions to political campaigns should not be a factor in appointment." In some nominations, it is the only factor. Senator Sarbanes cannot stem the tide. But he is

making the squalid practice a political issue, which it should be.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 18, 1989]

THE INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE

According to U.S. Rep. C. W. Bill Young, St. Petersburg developers Mel Sembler and Joseph Zappala have all sorts of qualifications for their new jobs as U.S. ambassadors to Australia and Spain, respectively.

"Australia is so much like the United States, and Mel Sembler certainly knows his way around the United States," Young said. "He is certainly able to communicate, which is one of the essential requirements of diplomacy." Young had similar praise for the diplomatic skills of Zappala, who he said "has handled a lot of touchy situations in his business life."

Sembler and Zappala may turn out to be excellent ambassadors, and their appointments by President Bush undoubtedly bring prominence to St. Petersburg. However, their selections had nothing whatsoever to do with their ability to find their way around, or to communicate, or to handle touchy situations.

Actually, that's not entirely true. Sembler and Zappala know their way around the power structure of the national Republican Party, and they know how to communicate in the international language: money. They were members of "Team 100," a group of donors who contributed at least \$100,000 each to the Republican Party during last fall's campaign. They also served as co-chairmen of the national committee that raised \$20-million to help pay for the Bush inaugural. The services rendered by Sembler and Zappala add up to serious qualifications for political appointment.

The practice of making ambassadorial appointments based on politics is neither new nor necessarily bad. Some political appointees with no previous diplomatic experience turn out to be excellent ambassadors. For example, former U.S. Sen. Mike Mansfield turned out to be an inspired choice as ambassador to Japan.

On the other hand, some career Foreign Service officers turn out to be inappropriate choices for particular assignments. John Negroponte, most recently U.S. ambassador to Honduras, has become a controversial choice as our new ambassador to Mexico because of his previous involvement with the Contra guerrillas fighting the government of Nicaragua. His predecessor in Mexico City, John Gavin, an old Hollywood friend of President Reagan's, won generally high marks for his diplomatic performance.

However, an overabundance of politically based ambassadorial appointments can cause problems. First, an influx of political appointees can harm the morale of career Foreign Service officers better qualified for diplomatic duty. The percentage of political appointments rose from about 25 percent to 40 percent during the Reagan years, with a concomitant decline in ambassadorships awarded on merit. That percentage may go even higher with President Bush's new appointments.

Of course, the real risk is that some political appointees can harm American interests because they lack the backgrounds and abilities needed to articulate and implement U.S. policy. Our new ambassador to Italy, another political ally of the new president, does not speak fluent Italian. Zappala, whose Spanish is similarly rudimentary, does not claim to be particularly familiar with the recent history of Spain's ambiva-

lent political and military relationship with the United States and the rest of Western Europe.

In the past, some new ambassadors' lack of preparation for their jobs has been offensive to host countries and has prevented our government from taking advantage of important diplomatic opportunities. Whether political appointees or career diplomats, our ambassadors should possess the same qualifications that we have come to expect of foreign diplomats serving in this country. Otherwise, we run the risk of creating touchy situations that even successful St. Petersburg developers aren't capable of getting us out of.

[From the Washington Post, June 23, 1989]

THE AMBASSADORS

We have been thinking of establishing yet another great public service honor: the Mrs. Farkas Award for the most exotic, not to say improbable, campaign-contributor appointee to the American diplomatic corps. Ruth Farkas, for those of you who may not remember, was the very rich woman who became famous when Richard Nixon's lawyer reported that she had complained about price-gouging in the dispensation of Nixon administration ambassadorships ("... isn't \$250,000 an awful lot of money for Costa Rica?"). Now, before you get us wrong, it is not our view that all ambassadorships need to go to Foreign Service officers or that campaign contributions should actually be disqualifying. There have been plenty of first-rate non-foreign service ambassadors over the years.

But in truth there have also been a lot more turkeys—incompetents, bad jokes, envoys who would more aptly be called the American embarrassment than the American ambassador. Nor is it as if these were always harmless appointments; real damage can be done and has been by some of the unsuited types and downright nitwits that this country has proudly sent overseas at the behest of Democratic as well as Republican administrations.

All this is background to the jousting now going on in the Senate, where Democrat Paul Sarbanes of Maryland has stalled Senate Foreign Relations Committee action on three administration appointees, putting off a final determination until after the July 4 recess. The embassies at issue are Spain, Australia and New Zealand. The nominees are a land developer, a businessman and a real estate broker. For all we know they may be well qualified, though Mr. Sarbanes thinks they are not and has pointed, among other things, to a rather discouraging aspect of their self-presentations before the committee. At the place on the resume form where would-be ambassadors are asked what special qualifications they have that were not previously mentioned by them, one wrote: "I have been known as a coalition builder, able to organize my colleagues and peers to action in support of worthy civic, charitable and political causes." Another wrote—guess what?—"I am known as a coalition builder. I am able to organize my colleagues and peers to action in support of worthwhile civic, charitable and political causes."

Modular testimony. Pre-fab (by someone else) self-description. It doesn't inspire a whole lot of confidence. Can the would-be ambassadors be trusted to enter into dialogue with their host governments if they, apparently, cannot be trusted to write a few lines on their own qualifications? Guidance

only gets you so far. We await with interest the next phase of the committee's hearing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ].

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I will also close my argument and respond briefly to my friend from Maryland and read the entirety of the paragraph regarding Mr. Zappala's ability to speak Spanish. I will read the entirety of the paragraph that my friend from Maryland read only in part:

Mr. Zappala readily acknowledged his deficiency in Spanish, and has already been enrolled in Spanish language training courses. However, Mr. Zappala has been totally fluent in Italian all of his life. Since Spanish and Italian are related romance languages with similar grammatical and rhetorical structures, with the common bond of a broadly cognate vocabulary and transferable language skills, the committee sees no reason to believe that Mr. Zappala will not be reasonably proficient in Spanish by the time that he takes up residence in Madrid.

So I think that Mr. Zappala will be doing just fine in Spanish.

My friend from Maryland refers to a table on page 12 of the report. I refer to a table on page 7 which gives figures that show this President, as have other Presidents before him, has stuck approximately to a 2-to-1 ratio, two careerists for one noncareerist, as the National Commission had recommended, 70 percent. So this President has said on a number of occasions that a 2-to-1 ratio will be continued.

Finally, Mr. President, I certainly accept as a correction the statement of my friend from Maryland that Mr. Flanigan did not go there. The research that was done for me was apparently incorrect in that instance.

Let me read, finally, Mr. President, a letter that I received from Mr. Zappala in which he expresses his gratitude for my support of his nomination. He continues after expressing that gratitude by saying:

It is true that I have little, if any experience in the field of foreign policy, but, since my nomination I have devoted myself to education, not only with regard to the country and its issues, but to the Spanish language as well.

As you know better than most, those of us who come out of the business sector also bring unique talents and new energies and make intelligent decisions.

I come to serve out of love of my country, and yes, honor! You know the personal sacrifice of being away from loved ones and the loss of opportunity. I am committed to apply all my energy and talent as Ambassador, if approved, and will make my country proud.

I believe, Mr. President, Joseph Zappala will achieve just that: He will make his country proud. I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES].

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to be very accurate and precise here. Apparently Elliot Richardson chaired, within the Commission on Public Service chaired by Paul Volcker, a task force on career/noncareer questions that suggested that not more than 30 percent of ambassadors be noncareer. The commission itself, in its report, apparently did not specifically address the issue of percentages in the State Department or any other agency. So that the point I make earlier should really refer back to a task force of the Commission. I elevated what was done at the task force level into a commission report, and I want to make sure that the record is clear in this regard.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of no quorum having been raised, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I made reference earlier to the treatment of this issue when the ex-Finance chairman complained in February that few jobs were going to Bush campaign fund-raisers. In this context I want to point out that last December, the American Foreign Service Association sent an open letter to the State Department transition team supporting, in principle, the appointment of a judicious number of noncareer ambassadorships.

It is interesting to note that the career service itself accepts this proposition. They did not argue for 100 percent career ambassadors, but suggested in that letter as a practical matter that the new administration might want to avoid the embarrassment of Senate challenges by screening its nominations carefully beforehand.

The transition team declined to meet with the representatives of the Foreign Service, but the Foreign Service people were encouraged early in the administration by the nomination of career offices to several key posts, including, for instance, the Ambassador to the United Nations.

Then came the spring and the surge of political nominations, which left the career service stunned and, they assert, left even friends of the President stunned. We have already gone through the statistics.

We have to ask what happened between the start of the administration and the rash of political appointments that followed. I submit perhaps what happened is reflected in the complaint

widely reported in newspaper articles that "few jobs go to Bush fund-raisers." Ambassadorial appointments were used to help balance the ledger of political obligations. That, of course, has helped to provoke the controversy we have today with respect to this nominee, which of course reflects more broadly what has been happening with respect to other nominees as well.

It was added to the argument made for political appointees that they are loyal to the President, as though somehow the career service is not loyal to the President, and indeed to the Nation. In fact, one of the questions I put to nominees in the committee—and I should have started it earlier—has to do with this question of loyalty. We have nominees who come before us and say: I am very eager to go. This is wonderful; the President has really shown his confidence in me, and I am a personal friend of the President's, and very loyal. I want to go overseas in order to carry out the President's policies.

The question I put to them is, where first do one's loyalties lie?

A noncareer nominee the other day gave the right answer to that question. She said, "The Constitution of the United States." And then subsequently, under questioning, we defined that further to include the statutes of the United States passed pursuant to that Constitution. A President who asks an ambassador or anyone else to do something contrary to a statute is in effect asking him or her to violate our constitutional process.

So it is true the President has a tremendous scope to direct our foreign policy, and in one respect our ambassadors are the personal representatives of the President. But the ambassadors are confirmed by the Senate. They are officials of the United States, and they have obligations that transcend "loyalty" only to the President.

The loyalty that is being talked about in these cases is really political giving. The Foreign Service is characterized by people who have given loyal service over decades, trying to serve the Nation. We are then told that political nominees can pick up the phone and call the President."

How much of that is going to happen? What one ought to do is let them go out and after a year or 18 months ask them, "How many times in the last year did you call up the President?" And if the number is large, one would then say, "Well, why are you harassing the President? Why are you calling him up all the time? Don't you think the President has other important things to do than to be constantly receiving phone calls?"

We have 130-some ambassadors overseas. Just think of the number of phone calls the President would have

to handle if all these people are going to call him.

In fact they are not going to be calling the President. I do not know why that argument is being advanced on their behalf.

That fact is, it is time for us to get serious about these matters. I do not think the United States today continues to enjoy the same luxury in the way we conduct our political and security affairs abroad that we might have at an earlier time, when our power was much more transcendent. We are now much more dependent, I think, on having able, skillful people to represent us, just as other countries send able, skillful representatives to the United States.

Before he came here, the current Soviet Ambassador in Washington served in Spain. He moved from that assignment first to the United Nations, but then very quickly to Washington.

That gives you some sense of the importance they attach to that diplomatic post. The Soviet Ambassador is an experienced career person.

The United States has to start doing business in a serious way. It is for that reason, because it will send as strong and clear a message as can be sent on this issue, that the Senate should reject this nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Joseph Zappala to be Ambassador to Spain. Mr. Zappala's nomination was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee in July, and I am pleased that we have finally turned to this matter.

There are other nominees who also await confirmation, and it is high time that we moved forward on those as well.

The President has nominated people who he feels to be qualified, responsible, and able to represent this great Nation abroad. The Senate has a role to play, and the ability to reject nominees that are unfit in the judgment of the Senate.

But we do no one a service when we hold up nominations on the basis of pure politics.

Presidents—both Democratic and Republican—have made ambassadorial appointments to both career foreign service officers and political appointees. The amount of criticism leveled at this President for political appointees is unseemly. Senator HELMS has covered all of that very skillfully and completely.

Many fine Ambassadors throughout our history have been political appointees, including the recently returned Ambassador to Japan, Mike Mansfield, who served with singular distinction and great honor.

I am a little puzzled at the ire directed at those who happened to have the temerity to be Republican campaign contributors and successful business persons.

Those are surely not characteristics that ought to disqualify any fine person from serving most ably as Ambassador for the United States.

Enough of this sophistry of thought and reason. I trust we will get on with the business at hand, and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this nomination.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, as I understand it, the Senate is in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. I wish to ask unanimous consent that the Senate then proceed to consider the following nominations:

Calendar No. 372, Claire E. Freeman, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Calendar No. 373, Eugene K. Lawson, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and

Calendar No. 374, Richard Schmalensee, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominees be confirmed, en bloc, that any statements appear in the RECORD as if read, that the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc, that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the several nominations are considered en bloc, confirmed en bloc and the motion to reconsider en bloc is laid on the table. The President is immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominees.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Claire E. Freeman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Eugene Kistler Lawson, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term of four years expiring January 20, 1993.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Richard Schmalensee, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. There will now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

COAL INDUSTRY HEALTH BENEFIT STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I want to speak in support of the legislation that the President pro tempore and Senator ROCKEFELLER of West Virginia have introduced, the Coal Industry Health Benefit Stabilization Act. For those States whose economies have historically not been tied to the coal industry, as ours have, the situation emerging in the bowels of the coal mine may not seem of very great concern, but if our colleagues are not now concerned, I would like to deliver a serious message. We have an extremely volatile situation on our hands in our coal fields which, if not resolved quickly may toll the demise of the coal industry as we know it.

After nearly a decade of labor peace, our nation's coal fields once again are echoing with violence. Neither unsafe working conditions nor inadequate wages are the cause of this very grave unrest. No, it is the impetus that is derived from the cancellation of critical health benefits from retirees.

Mr. President, for some more than 133,000 retired miners and their children, health insurance in the UMW health program ranks as the most important benefit they now receive.

And now those very retirees who spent a lifetime below ground with pick and shovel working to heat our homes, fuel our industries, find that at least one and maybe more of their old employers are forsaking them.

Mr. President, coal mining, as I know the Chair knows, is a physically dangerous and risk-laden profession, the most dangerous in this country. With each descent into the pit, our miners face the probability of disease, black lung, or injury. And these illnesses or injuries too often affect the miners not just for a week or a month or a few years but for a lifetime and into retirement years as well.

One constituent of mine worked 28 years in a Smithfield, PA mine. He recently wrote that he never expected anything in return except pension and health benefits in retirement. Mr. President, this is a disabled veteran. He has had open heart surgery. And in

June, his company cut off his health benefits. And he writes "I am being forced into poverty."

Mr. President, for somebody who has worked all their life, who has endeavored to stay off the dole, out of welfare, to retain all that pride, that is a terrible admission, a terrible fate to contemplate.

So we are sitting on a time bomb and already 16 coal companies have gone back on the promises made to miners by ending all contributions to the United Mine Workers and the Bituminous Coal Operators Association health benefit funds.

Abandoning health benefits to retirees is not, I am sorry to say, a new experience. We have had to go through this before. Just 2 years ago my friend and colleague from Ohio, Senator METZENBAUM, and I fought to protect some 78,000 LTV retirees from losing their health care benefits when LTV in bankruptcy tried to terminate their retirees' health plan. We were fortunate that we won that battle. That war really continues today.

Congressional commitment to this special group of retirees, a commitment I might add that is very strongly rooted in history, must continue. The bill we have introduced would force coal companies to honor that very historic commitment to retiree health benefits and to penalize those who irresponsibly seek to dump it.

Specifically, the bill would permit the transfer of surplus dollars from pension funds covering United Mine Worker miners in Appalachia, such as the greatly overfunded 1950 pension plan, to the health benefit trust. And, the bill makes clear that health benefits must be treated like pension benefits with appropriate sanctions for fund withdrawals.

Mr. President, the issue before us today is one of fundamental decency—both acknowledging a truly national debt and honoring a promise. Our debt is to those who dedicated their lives and limbs to mining black coal. Our promise is to protect those laborers at a time of greatest vulnerability, with adequate health benefits in retirement.

I urge our colleagues to join in that effort.

FOREIGN CURRENCY REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following report(s) of standing committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY, FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 1 TO MAR. 31, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Philippines	Peso	2,690.27	126.00					2,690.27	126.00
Thailand	Baht	7,878	314.00					7,878	314.00
Malaysia	Ringgit	267.30	99.00					267.30	99.00
Singapore	Dollar	285.18	147.00					285.18	147.00
South Korea	Won	426,190	624.00					426,190	624.00
Andrew K. Semmel:									
Philippines	Peso	5,380.53	252.00					5,380.53	252.00
Thailand	Baht	7,878	314.00					7,878	314.00
Malaysia	Ringgit	399.60	148.00					399.60	148.00
Singapore	Dollar	285.18	147.00					285.18	147.00
South Korea	Won	426,190	624.00					426,190	624.00
Total			2,795.00						2,795.00

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, July 19, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
William A. Gilton:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,665.30	1,005.00					1,665.30	1,005.00
John J. Ziolkowski:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,665.30	1,005.00	110.00	66.95			1,775.30	1,071.95
United States	Dollar				994.80				994.80
William A. Gilton:									
United States	Dollar				1,301.08				1,301.08
Total			2,010.00		2,362.83				4,372.83

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, July 19, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert E. Bayer:									
Republic of Germany	Dollar		83.50						83.50
Italy	Lire	801,062	586.00					801,062	586.00
United States	Dollar				669.00				669.00
Dunwood W. Ringo, Jr.:									
Italy	Lire	569,296	391.00					569,296	391.00
Republic of Germany	Mark	620.24	344.58					620.24	344.58
Belgium	Franc	5,586	133.00					5,586	133.00
Judith A. Freedman:									
Italy	Lire	569,296	391.00					569,296	391.00
Republic of Germany	Mark	620.24	344.58					620.24	344.58
Belgium	Franc	5,586	133.00					5,586	133.00
Senator John McCain:									
Honduras	Lempira	194	97.00					194	97.00
El Salvador	Colone	770	154.00					770	154.00
Lorne W. Craner:									
Honduras	Lempira	194	97.00					194	97.00
El Salvador	Colone	770	154.00					770	154.00
Senator Sam Nunn:									
Republic of Germany	Mark	2,633.40	1,330.00					2,633.40	1,330.00
Arnold L. Punaro:									
Republic of Germany	Mark	3,381.84	1,708.00					3,381.84	1,708.00
Total			5,946.66		669.00				6,615.66

SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, June 30, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Timothy Riese:									
Guatemala	Dollar		80.00						80.00
Honduras	Dollar		245.00						245.00
William P. Jones:									
France	Franc	8,492.401	1,345.00	353	56.03			8,845.40	1,401.03
United States	Dollar				4,392.00				4,382.00
Robert M. Walker:									
United Kingdom	Dollar		627.00						627.00
Germany	Dollar		85.00						85.00
Denmark	Dollar		137.00						137.00
Norway	Dollar		316.00						316.00
Iceland	Dollar		81.00						81.00
Total			2,916.00		4,438.03				7,354.03

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Sept. 5, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL JAN. 5-19, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Timothy E. Wirth:									
Paraguay	Guarani	358,750	350.00					358,750	350.00
Chile	Peso	39,476	139.00					39,476	139.00
Brazil	Cruzado	1,593,960	1,252.00					1,593,960	1,252.00
Senator John Heinz:									
United States	Dollar				1,117.00				1,117.00
Brazil	Cruzado	1,102,200	835.00					1,102,200	835.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Paraguay	Guarani	384,375	375.00					384,375	375.00
Argentina	Austral	2,912.78	177.50					2,912.78	177.50
Chile	Peso	39,476	139.00					39,476	139.00
Brazil	Cruzado	837,608	679.00					837,608	679.00
Peru	Intis	104,762	98.00					104,762	98.00
Jim Martin:									
Paraguay	Guarani	512,500	500.00					512,500	500.00
Chile	Peso	39,476	139.00					39,476	139.00
Brazil	Cruzado	1,593,960	1,252.00					1,593,960	1,252.00
Richard Roberts:									
Paraguay	Guarani	384,375	375.00					384,375	375.00
Argentina	Austral	2,912.78	177.50					2,912.78	177.50
Chile	Peso	39,476	139.00					39,476	139.00
Brazil	Cruzado	1,593,960	1,252.00					1,593,960	1,252.00
Delegation Expenses: ¹									
Brazil						6,515.57			6,515.57
Paraguay						6,765.03			6,765.03
Argentina						1,609.39			1,609.39
Chile						2,625.41			2,625.41
Peru						300.00			300.00
Total			7,879.00		1,117.00		17,815.40		26,811.40

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977. The following individuals traveled with the delegation under authorization as noted: Senator Albert Gore, Jr.—Commerce Committee. Jerald Mande—Commerce Committee. Sally Walsh—Majority Leader. Reports of their expenditures appear in the report of the authorizing source. Representative John Bryant—House Judiciary Committee. Representative Gerry Sikorski—House Energy and Commerce Committee.

DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
July 17, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kim Shafer:									
China	Yuan	3,044.40	820.00					3,044.40	820.00
United States	Dollar		164.00		2,054.00				2,218.00
Bradley D. Belt:									
China	Yuan	3,044.40	820.00					3,044.40	820.00
United States	Dollar		164.00		2,054.00				2,218.00
Jennifer Hillman:									
China	Yuan	3,044.40	820.00					3,044.40	820.00
United States	Dollar		164.00		2,054.00				2,218.00
Total			2,952.00		6,162.00				9,114.00

DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
June 30, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Daryl H. Owen:									
France	Franc	8,492	1,230.50	353	53.48			8,845	1,283.98
United States	Dollar				4,382.00				4,382.00
Senator J. Bennett Johnston:									
France	Franc	8,492	1,230.50	353	53.48	897.15	130.00	9,742.15	1,413.98
United States	Dollar				4,382.00				4,382.00
Gina Despres:									
Soviet Union	Dollar		667.00						667.00
United States	Dollar				3,776.00				3,776.00
Senator Dale Bumpers:									
Brazil	Cruzado	815.96	466.26					815.96	466.26
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Total			3,896.26		12,646.96		130.00		16,673.22

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Aug. 7, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS, FOR TRAVEL FROM MAR. 26 TO APR. 3, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Chafee:									
Brazil	Cruzado	878.50	502.00					878.50	502.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Senator Steve Symms:									
Brazil	Cruzado	1,475.25	843.00					1,475.25	843.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Trent Clark:									
Brazil	Cruzado	1,475.25	843.00					1,475.25	843.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Robert F. Hurley:									
Brazil	Cruzado	852.25	487.00					852.25	487.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Steven J. Shimberg:									
Brazil	Cruzado	878.50	502.00					878.50	502.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
David M. Strauss:									
Brazil	Cruzado	1,475.25	843.00					1,475.25	843.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Delegation expenses: ¹									
Brazil							2,020.84		2,020.84
Venezuela							2,452.64		2,452.64
Total			5,832.00				4,473.48		10,305.48

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977. In addition to those named above, the following individuals accompanied this delegation: Senator Arlen Specter and Gordon Woodrow authorized by the Republican Leader; Senator Dale Bumpers authorized by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Reports of their expenditures appear in the report of the authorizing source.

QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Sept. 8, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Chafee:									
Belize	Dollar	1,129.79	574.52					1,129.79	574.52
United States	Dollar				412.00				412.00
Robert F. Hurley:									
Belize	Dollar	1,129.79	574.52					1,129.79	574.52
United States	Dollar				412.00				412.00
Steven J. Shimberg:									
Belize	Dollar	1,129.79	574.52					1,129.79	574.52
United States	Dollar				794.00				794.00
David M. Strauss:									
Belize	Dollar	1,129.79	574.52					1,129.79	574.52
United States	Dollar				412.00				412.00
Total			2,298.08		2,030.00				4,328.08

QUENTIN BURDICK,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Sept. 8, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, FOR TRAVEL MAR. 17-29, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lloyd Bentsen:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Senator Bob Packwood:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Senator Max Baucus:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Senator David Pryor:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Jeffrey Lang:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Brad Figel:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	294.66	182.43					294.66	182.43
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Gay Burton:									
England	Pound	394.17	678.00					394.17	678.00
Belgium	Franc	14,329	366.00					14,329	366.00
Italy	Lire	863,100	630.00					863,100	630.00
Switzerland	Franc	324.66	201.00					324.66	201.00
France	Franc	2,755.90	434.00					2,755.90	434.00
Delegation Expenses: ¹									
England							7,298.06		7,298.06
Belgium							2,615.03		2,615.03
France							2,822.29		2,822.29
Italy							5,348.73		5,348.73
Switzerland							1,220.39		1,220.39
Total		xxxxxxx	16,144.43	xxxxxxx		xxxxxxx	19,607.68	xxxxxxx	35,752.11

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the State Department and to the Defense Department under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977. The following individual traveled with the delegation under authorization as noted: Ms. Yvonne L. Hopkins—Majority Leader. Report of her expenditure appears in the report of the authorizing source.

LLOYD BENTSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 31, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P. L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marcia Miller:									
Switzerland	Franc	1,331.35	792.00					1,331.35	792.00
Belgium	Franc	19,832	488.00					19,832	488.00
United States	Dollar				999.33				999.33
Total			1,280.00		999.33				2,279.33

LLOYD BENTSEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 17, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL JAN. 4-16, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard G. Lugar:									
Philippines	Peso	2,690.26	126.00					2,690.26	126.00
Thailand	Baht	5,362	214.00					5,362	214.00
Malaysia	Ringgit	267.30	99.00					267.30	99.00
Singapore	Dollar	285.18	147.00					285.18	147.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL JAN. 4-16, 1989—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Korea.....	Won.....	426,190	624.00					426,190	624.00
Charles Andrease:									
Philippines.....	Peso.....	5,380.53	252.00					5,380.53	252.00
Thailand.....	Baht.....	5,362	214.00					5,362	214.00
Malaysia.....	Ringgit.....	399.60	148.00					399.60	148.00
Singapore.....	Dollar.....	285.18	147.00					285.18	147.00
Korea.....	Won.....	426,190	624.00					426,190	624.00
Delegation expenses: ¹									
Hawaii.....			739.91				1,431.83		2,171.74
Thailand.....					766.43		659.90		1,426.33
Total.....			3,334.91		766.43		2,091.73		6,193.07

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and to the Department of Defense under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977. Senator Thad Cochran and Andy Semmel traveled with the delegation under the authority of the Committee on Agriculture. Reports of their expenditures appear in the report of the authorizing source.

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 12, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gordon J. Humphrey:									
Pakistan.....	Rupee.....	825	39.14					825	39.14
United Kingdom.....	Pound.....			128	197.12			128	197.12
United States.....	Dollar.....				3,419.72	96.00			3,515.72
Geryld Christianson:									
United States.....	Dollar.....				2,200.00				2,200.00
Deborah DeMoss:									
El Salvador.....	Colon.....	770	154.00					770	154.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				684.00				684.00
Thomas C. Kleine:									
Pakistan.....	Rupee.....	1,220	57.87					1,220	57.87
United States.....	Dollar.....				3,544.72				3,544.72
Nancy H. Stetson:									
Kenya.....	Shilling.....	17,474.30	909.21	3,092	161.23			20,566.30	1,070.44
Ethiopia.....	Birr.....	257.41	125.29					257.41	125.29
Sudan.....	Dollar.....		500.00						500.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				4,399.20				4,399.20
Total.....			1,785.51		14,605.99		96.00		16,487.50

CLAIBORNE PELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 12, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER
AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David B. Buckley:									
England.....	Pound.....	399.50	678.00					399.50	678.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				599.00				599.00
Randy J. Rydell:									
England.....	Pound.....	399.50	678.00					399.50	678.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				599.00				599.00
Mary K. Vinson:									
England.....	Pound.....	399.50	678.00					399.50	678.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				599.00				599.00
Edwin S. Jane:									
Japan.....	Yen.....	193,880	1,480.00					193,880	1,480.00
United States.....	Dollar.....				1,433.00				1,433.00
Total.....			3,514.00		3,230.00				6,744.00

JOHN GLENN,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, July 19, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael E. Iskowitz:									
Canada	Dollar	765.18	635.00			500	415.00	1,265.18	1,050.00
United States	Dollar				372.14				372.14
Total			635.00		372.14		415.00		1,422.14

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, July 5, 1989.

AMENDED CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-385—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 1988

Name	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator David Boren			2,668.00						2,668.00
George Tenet			2,668.00						2,668.00
Senator Sam Nunn			2,668.00						2,668.00
Arnold Punaro			2,668.00						2,668.00
David Cox			2,668.00						2,668.00
Total			13,340.00						13,340.00

DAVID L. BOREN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, June 30, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, ON TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Holliday			679.00						679.00
James Currie			679.00						679.00
Christopher Straub			515.00						515.00
Marvin Ott			718.00		3,143.48				3,861.48
John Despres			673.00		3,776.00				4,449.00
Senator Bill Bradley			673.00		3,776.00				4,449.00
Senator Dennis DeConcini			1,022.38						1,022.38
Howard Walgren			1,694.00						1,694.00
Gregorio Cater			1,002.00		2,727.00				3,729.00
John Nelson			949.00		2,727.00				3,676.00
Christopher Straub			474.00		3,574.00				4,048.00
Regina Ganton			394.00		3,574.00				3,968.00
Larry Kettlewell			894.00		3,574.00				4,468.00
Total			10,366.38		26,871.48				37,237.86

DAVID BOREN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Intelligence, June 30, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Freshwater:									
United States	Dollar				665.59				665.59
Canada	Dollar	848.32	704.00					848.83	704.00
Total			704.00		665.59				1,369.59

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, Aug. 17, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert A. Hand:									
Switzerland	Franc	743.37	453.00	343.00	209.00			1,086.37	662.00
United States	Dollar					99.09			99.09
France	Franc	3,178.01	501.00					3,178.01	501.00
Jane S. Fisher:									
Belgium	Franc	10,538.92	266.00					10,538.92	266.00
United States	Dollar				2,176.60				2,176.60
United Kingdom	Pound	204.80	352.00					204.80	352.00
United States	Dollar				2,841.00				2,841.00
Senator Dennis DeConcini:									
France	Franc	2,731.04	404.00					2,731.04	404.00
Samuel G. Wise:									
France	Franc	12,820.20	1,914.00			180.00	26.47	13,000.20	1,940.47
United States	Dollar				2,295.80				2,295.80
Orest Deychak:									
France	Franc	26,188.80	3,858.00					26,188.80	3,858.00
United States	Dollar				599.00				599.00
Jesse L. Jacobs:									
France	Franc	14,762.80	1,002.00					14,762.80	1,002.00
United States	Dollar				593.00				593.00
Erika B. Schlager:									
France	Franc	31,103	4,588.00					31,103	4,588.00
United States	Dollar				1,489.00				1,489.00
Catherine Cosman:									
France	Franc	31,103	4,588.00					31,103	4,588.00
United States	Dollar				599.00				599.00
Ann W. Banchoff:									
France	Franc	33,420.96	4,922.00					33,420.96	4,922.00
United States	Dollar				822.00				822.00
Germany	Mark	723.40	372.50					723.40	372.50
Robert A. Hand:									
France	Franc	26,039.56	3,822.00					26,039.56	3,822.00
United States	Dollar				599.00				599.00
Jane S. Fisher:									
France	Franc	29,967.40	4,421.00					29,967.40	4,421.00
United States	Dollar				1,489.00				1,489.00
Delegation expenses: ¹									
France							4,113.01		4,113.01
Total			31,463.50		13,712.40		4,238.57		49,414.47

¹ Delegation expenses include payment to the Department of State under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384.

DENNIS DeCONCINI,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
July 25, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL JUNE 26-28, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator George J. Mitchell:									
Canada	Dollar	245.47	206.28					245.47	206.28
Jan Paulk:									
Canada	Dollar	232.45	195.34					232.45	195.34
Kate Kimball:									
Canada	Dollar	244.37	205.35					244.37	205.35
Diane Dewhurst:									
Canada	Dollar	246.11	206.82					246.11	206.82
Delegation expenses: ¹									
Canada							199.29		199.29
Total			813.79				199.29		1,013.08

¹ Delegation expenses include payment to the Department of State under authority of section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384.

GEORGE J. MITCHELL,
Majority Leader, July 20, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL JAN. 6-18, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mark O. Hatfield:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	7,360.7	576.00					7,360.7	576.00
Senator James A. McClure:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL JAN. 6-18, 1989—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	7,360.7	576.00					7,360.7	576.00
Gerald W. Frank:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	12,267.8	960.00					12,267.8	960.00
Jack Gerard:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	12,267.8	960.00					12,267.8	960.00
Jan Paulk:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	12,267.8	960.00					12,267.8	960.00
Janet Lamos:									
Belgium	Franc	21,177	567.00					21,177	567.00
Bulgaria	Dollar		188.00						188.00
Romania	Dollar		192.00						192.00
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	3,623.9	388.00					3,623.9	388.00
Austria	Schilling	12,267.8	960.00					12,267.8	960.00
Delegation expenses: ¹									
Belgium						2,422.01			2,422.01
Bulgaria						1,584.29			1,584.29
Romania						714.58			714.58
Czechoslovakia						1,397.09			1,397.09
Austria						3,843.50			3,843.50
Total			13,002.00			9,961.47			22,963.47

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the State Department and to the Defense Department under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S.Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

ROBERT J. DOLE,
Republican Leader, July 31, 1989.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P. L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 1989

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator William V. Roth, Jr.:									
Netherlands	Guilder	709.90	336.00					709.90	336.00
R. Ian Butterfield:									
Netherlands	Guilder	709.90	336.00					709.90	336.00
Belgium	Franc	21,078	532.00					21,078	532.00
United States	Dollar				599.00				599.00
Gordon Woodrow:									
Brazil	Cruzado	1,475.25	843.00					1,475.25	843.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	10,947.50	302.00					10,947.50	302.00
Senator Arlen Specter:									
Brazil	Cruzado	1,018.50	582.00					1,018.50	582.00
Venezuela	Bolivar	8,555	236.00					8,555	236.00
Total			3,167.00		599.00				3,776.00

ROBERT J. DOLE,
Republican Leader, Aug. 4, 1989.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1989, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 29, 1989, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the President of the United States transmitting the withdrawal of a nomination; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The withdrawal received on September 29, 1989 is printed in today's RECORD at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

DEFERRAL OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 64

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying documents; which, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified, was referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Fi-

nance, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report seven deferrals of budget authority totaling \$1,380,399,855.

The deferrals affect the International Security Assistance program, as well as programs of the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health and Human Services, State, and Transportation.

The details of these deferrals are contained in the attached report.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 2, 1989.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 2:09 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 1 through October 7, 1989, as "National Health Care Food Service Week";

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 19, 1989, through November 25, 1989, and the week of November 18, 1990, through November 24, 1990, as "National Family Week";

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating October 1989 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1989, and October 16, 1990, as "World Food Day"; and

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 8, 1989, through October 14, 1989, as "National Job Skills Week".

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 2, 1989, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 1, through October 7, 1989, as "National Health Care Food Service Week";

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 9, 1989, through November 25, 1989, and the week of November 18, 1990, through November 24, 1990, as "National Family Week";

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution designating October 1989 as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1989, and October 16, 1990, as "World Food Day"; and

S.J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 8, 1989, through October 14, 1989, as "National Job Skills Week".

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1712. An original bill to amend the Security Exchange Act of 1934 to authorize appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission for fiscal years 1990 through 1991, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 101-155).

By Mr. BINGAMAN, from the Impeachment Trial Committee (In Re. Judge Alcee L. Hastings):

Special Report entitled "Report of the Impeachment Trial Committee on the Articles Against Judge Alcee L. Hastings" (Rept. No. 101-156).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1711. A bill to implement the President's 1989 National Drug Control Strategy; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. 1712. An original bill to amend the Security Exchange Act of 1934 to authorize appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission for fiscal years 1990 through 1991, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1713. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on p-hydroxybenzaldehyde; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1714. A bill to reestablish the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. McCURE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GORTON, Mr. COATS, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GARN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SASSER, Mr. GORE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. GLENN):

S.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution to designate October 22 through October 29, 1989, as "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug Free America"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1711. A bill to implement the President's 1989 national drug control strategy; ordered placed on the Calendar.

IMPLEMENTING THE PRESIDENT'S 1989 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week, the Senate approved the Department of Transportation appropriation bill which fully funded the President's national drug control strategy and crime bill. Also contained in the bill were four legislative initiatives which were proposed in the strategy. Leaving just one remaining item for consideration by this body.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement that controlled consideration of the appropriation bill, the Senate agreed to consider the remaining initiative as a free standing bill. Today, I

am introducing that bill, which requires drug testing by State and local governments of those arrested, incarcerated or on probation or parole.

There has been a fair amount of controversy concerning this provision. It has been suggested that the cost of requiring State and local officials to drug test everyone falling into these categories would be prohibitive. I admit that, if the requirement were that extensive, the administration estimated cost of \$800 million would be beyond the ability of State and local governments to pay.

However, that is not contemplated by the bill. It merely requires that each State, within its own drug strategy, must include drug testing of some of those arrested, some incarcerated and some of those on probation or parole.

Therefore, the \$800 million estimate is not valid in the discussion of this bill, since no requirement to test all individuals in those classes is contained in the bill.

But, we do need the information which would result from this testing. We need to know how much drug use contributes to crime, how much drug use exists in prisons and jails, and whether drug use is prevalent among those who are released on probation or parole. And, quite frankly, we should take action against those who test negative, as is required by the bill. For example, if a convicted felon is found to be using drugs while in prison, I would suggest that he is probably not the best candidate for parole.

I do not think anyone can disagree that this provision is an essential component in our coordinated efforts to fight drug supply and abuse. The Congress called for the drug strategy, the administration provided a solid blueprint for the war on drugs, and it's now time for the Congress to complete the circle by approving the remaining legislative initiative from the strategy—now.

Finally, Mr. President, the agreement entered on the Transportation appropriation bill also provides for consideration of the President's crime bill before we adjourn. As with this provision, if we are serious about combating drug abuse and other crime in our country, we must give the police, prosecutors and the courts the necessary nonmoney tools they are demanding—the death penalty, habeas corpus reform and a good faith exemption to the exclusionary rule. We have proven that we can spend money on the problem, it is now time to prove that we can address the other parts of the package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION ONE. AMENDMENT RELATING TO JUSTICE ASSISTANCE AND DRUG TESTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end of part E (42 U.S.C. 3750-3766b) the following:

"DRUG TESTING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 523. (a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—No funding shall be provided under this part, whether by direct grant, cooperative agreement, or assistance in any form, to any State or to any political subdivision or instrumentality of a State that has not formulated and implemented a drug testing program, subject to periodic review by the Attorney General, as specified in the regulations described in subsection (b), for targeted classes of arrestees, individuals in jails, prisons, and other correctional facilities, and persons on conditional or supervised release before or after conviction, including probationers, parolees, and persons released on bail.

"(b) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall, not later than six months after the enactment of this section, promulgate regulations for drug testing programs under this section, which shall be based in part on scientific and technical standards determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure reliability and accuracy of drug test results. In addition to specifying acceptable methods and procedures for carrying out drug testing, the regulations may include guidelines or specifications concerning—

(1) the classes of persons to be targeted for testing;

(2) the drugs to be tested for;

(3) the frequency and duration of testing; and

(4) the effect of test results in decisions concerning the sentence, the conditions to be imposed on release before or after conviction, and the granting, continuation, or termination of such release.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect with respect to any State, subdivisions, or instrumentality receiving or seeking funding under this subchapter at a time specified by the Attorney General, but no earlier than the promulgation of the regulations required under subsection (b)."

(b) AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by inserting at the end of the item relating to part E the following:

"Sec. 523. Drug Testing Programs."

By Mr. DOLE:

S. 1713. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on p-hydroxybenzaldehyde; to the Committee on Finance.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation which will temporarily suspend U.S. duty on a chemical, p-hydroxybenzaldehyde, which is not currently imported into the United States and which does not compete with any product made in the

United States. Accordingly, I believe that this legislation is noncontroversial and will have no impact on Government revenues.

By Mr. SIMON:

S. 1714. A bill to reestablish the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
AMENDMENT ACT

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, authorization of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is set to expire on November 30, 1989. The Subcommittee on the Constitution, which I chair, has jurisdiction over reauthorization. Today I am introducing a bill that would reestablish a revitalized Civil Rights Commission after the current authority expires. My bill would enable the Commission to start with a clean slate, without the political acrimony and charges of bad faith that have marred the credibility of the Commission in the past several years.

Since 1957, when the Civil Rights Commission was established, our country has made tremendous progress in fulfilling the promise of equal rights. But the problems of discrimination have not been solved; indeed, they have grown more complex. I believe the mission of the Commission is too important to let it die, or to let it continue with as little credibility as it has had in recent years. We need a Civil Rights Commission that is true to its original purpose as an "independent, bipartisan, fact-finding agency."

Under my bill, the Commission would continue to have eight members. The President would appoint four to staggered terms; the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House would each have two appointments. To protect the independence of the Commission, members could be removed from office by the President only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office. There are limits on compensation and travel expenses, to avoid problems experienced in the past.

The legislation expands the scope of the Commission's charge to study and report on discrimination based on color, race, religion, sex, age, or disability by adding discrimination based on language. Annual reports to Congress are required, in addition to other reports the Commission might publish. In recognition of its special expertise and independence, the new Commission is also given the authority to file amicus curiae briefs before the U.S. Supreme Court, when appropriate.

Mr. President, in drafting my bill I have relied on the advice of many of my colleagues, as well as many civil rights leaders, with whom I shared earlier drafts. Many have given me detailed suggestions that I have incorpo-

rated in this legislation. Almost all have supported the concept of a new, revitalized Commission.

These can perhaps best be expressed in the words of Dr. Arthur Flemming, former Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

I believe that if the principal components of your draft bill were enacted into law, Congress would have laid the foundation for the achievement of * * * an autonomous, bipartisan agency with members who are both independent and of unquestioned ability. We hope that * * * the Congress will act soon to give the Nation once again the services of a bipartisan, independent U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this historic legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"This Act may be cited as the 'United States Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1989'."

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS.

The United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983 (42 U.S.C. 1975 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

"This Act may be cited as the 'United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1989'."

"SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

"There is established a United States Commission on Civil Rights (hereinafter referred to in this Act as the 'Commission')."

"SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION.

"(a) APPOINTMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall consist of eight members, of which—

"(A) four members shall be appointed by the President;

"(B) two members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and

"(C) two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(b) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than four members of the Commission may be from the same political party.

"(c) TERMS OF OFFICE, VACANCIES, AND DISMISSAL.—

"(1) INITIAL TERM.—The terms of office for the initial members of the Commission appointed under subsection (a) shall be—

"(A) for the appointments made under subsection (a)(1)(A)—

"(i) a period of 4 years for two such members; and

"(ii) a period of 2 years for two such members;

"(B) for the appointments under subsection (a)(1)(B)—

"(i) a period of 3 years for one such member; and

"(ii) a period of 6 years for one such member; and

"(C) for the appointments under subsection (a)(1)(C)—

"(i) a period of 3 years for one such member; and

"(ii) a period of 6 years for one such member.

"(2) **SUBSEQUENT TERM.**—The term of office for members of the Commission who are appointed subsequent to initial members appointed under paragraph (1) shall be 6 years.

"(3) **DURATION OF TERM OF OFFICE.**—An individual shall not serve for more than 12 years on the Commission.

"(4) **VACANCIES.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A vacancy on the Commission shall not affect the powers of such Commission. A vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

"(B) **TERM OF SUCCESSOR.**—An individual who is appointed to fill a vacancy on the Commission shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of such individual was appointed.

"(5) **DISMISSAL FROM OFFICE.**—The President may remove a member of the Commission only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

"(c) **CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, AND STAFF DIRECTOR.**—

"(1) **SELECTION.**—There shall be a Chair, Vice Chair, and full-time Staff Director of the Commission, who shall be selected by a majority of the members of the Commission.

"(2) **TERM OF CHAIR.**—The Chair of the Commission shall serve for a term not to exceed 3 years and may serve successive terms.

"(3) **VICE CHAIR.**—The Vice Chair shall act in the place of the Chair in the absence of the Chair.

"(d) **COMPENSATION.**—

"(1) **MEMBERS.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Federal government shall receive a sum equivalent to the compensation paid at level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, pursuant to section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, prorated on a daily basis for each day spent in the work of the Commission.

"(B) **TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.**—Each member of the Commission shall receive reasonable allowances for necessary expenses of travel, lodging, and subsistence incurred in attending meetings and other activities of the Commission in amounts that shall not exceed the maximum fixed by subchapter 1 of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for officers and employees of the United States.

"(C) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEE.**—Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Federal government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid expenses as provided under subparagraph (B).

"(D) **LIMITATION.**—The total amount that each member of the Commission may receive under subparagraphs (A) through (C) in any one calendar year shall not exceed one third of the total compensation paid to the Staff Director in any one calendar year under paragraph (2).

"(2) **STAFF DIRECTOR.**—The Staff Director of the Commission shall receive a sum equivalent to the compensation paid at level

III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule, pursuant to section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

"SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing, made under oath or affirmation and setting forth facts on which such allegation is based, that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of the right to vote and have such vote counted by reason of color, race, religion, sex, age, language, disability, or national origin;

"(2) study and collect information, and appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government, concerning infringements of equal opportunity because of race, color, religion, sex, age, language, disability, or national origin.

"(3) serve as national clearinghouse for information concerning discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, language, disability, or national origin, including the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, and transportation, or in the Administration of justice; and

"(4) investigate allegations, made in writing and under oath or affirmation, that citizens are unlawfully being accorded or denied the right to vote and to have such vote properly counted in any election of the Presidential electors, Members of the Senate, or Members of the House of Representatives, as a result of any patterns or practice of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of such election.

"(b) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this or any other Act shall be construed as authorizing the Commission, the advisory committees of the Commission (as established under section 5(b)(1)), or any individual under the supervision or control of the Commission to investigate any membership practice or internal operation of any fraternal organization, college or university fraternity or sorority, or any religious organization.

"(c) **AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS.**—The Commission may submit an amicus curiae brief to the Supreme Court of the United States on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Commission, if a majority of the members of the Commission approve the submission of such brief.

"(d) **REPORTS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to any other reports submitted by the Commission, the Commission shall submit an annual report to Congress and to the President concerning—

"(A) the existing status of civil rights in the United States;

"(B) the enforcement of civil rights laws by Federal, State, and local governments;

"(C) the existing status of the political, social, and economic equality of minorities and women;

"(D) the impact of Federal fiscal policies, programs, and activities on minorities and women; and

"(E) any other information that the majority of Commission members determines appropriate.

"(2) **VOTING AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION.**—

"(A) **APPRAISAL.**—The Commission shall appraise the laws and policies of each State and the Federal government with respect to denials of the right to vote and the political participation of minority groups, including African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, Americans from the Pacific Islands, women, and disabled individuals.

"(B) **REPORT.**—The Commission may conduct studies and make appraisals and recommendations concerning public and private affirmative action programs.

"(e) **ABORTION.**—Nothing in this or any other Act shall be construed as authorizing the Commission, the advisory committees of the Commission (as established under section 5(b)(1)), or an individual under the supervision or control of the Commission to appraise, study, and collect information concerning the laws and policies of the Federal government, or any other governmental entity, with respect to abortion.

"SEC. 5. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

"(a) **EMPLOYEES.**—The Commission may hire employees and procure services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code. The rate of compensation paid to such individuals by the Commission may not exceed the daily equivalent paid for positions at the maximum rate for an individual who is at a position equivalent to GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) **ADVISORY COMMITTEES.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall establish an advisory committee in each State that shall be composed of citizens of such State.

"(2) **DIVERSITY OF MEMBERSHIP.**—

"(A) **POLITICAL AFFILIATION.**—Not more than 50 percent of the members of each advisory committee shall be from the same political party.

"(B) **OTHER FACTORS.**—Each advisory committee shall have a diverse membership in regards to race, ethnicity, religion, sex, language disability, and national origin.

"(3) **INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.**—An advisory committee established under paragraph (1) shall have the same investigative authority as the Commission has under section 6, except that such committee shall not—

"(A) subpoena a witness or require such witness to produce written or other material for the Commission; and

"(B) conduct investigations beyond the boundary of the State where such committee is located.

"(c) **CONSULTATION.**—The Commission may consult with governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local governments and private organizations, as the Commission considers appropriate.

"(d) **EXEMPTION.**—Members of the Commission, and members of advisory committees established pursuant to subsection (b), shall be exempt from sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(e) **RULES AND REGULATIONS.**—The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act.

"(f) **TRANSFER OF RECORDS.**—The Commission shall arrange for the transfer of all files, records, and balances of appropriations of the Commission on Civil Rights as established by the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983 to the Commission established by this Act.

"(g) **TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES.**—

"(1) **TRANSFER TO ORIGINAL POSITION.**—On the application of an individual who—

"(A) is employed in a position at General Schedule 13 grade (established pursuant to subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code) or below such grade; and

"(B) was an employee of the Commission on Civil Rights as established by United

States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983, who was employed by the Commission on Civil Rights on the date of enactment of this Act;

the Commission shall consider and appoint such individual to a position with the equivalent duties, responsibilities, and rate of pay as the position held by such individual on the Commission on Civil Rights as established by the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983.

"(2) OTHER EMPLOYEES.—The Commission may appoint an employee of the Commission on Civil Rights, who is not described under paragraph (1) and did not serve the Commission on Civil Rights in the capacity of a Commissioner or staff director, to a new position within the Commission.

"(3) RIGHTS AND BENEFITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an employee transferred to the Commission under this subsection shall retain all rights and benefits that such employee was entitled to or eligible for immediately prior to such transfer to the Commission.

"(h) PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register—

"(A) a description of central and field organizations of the Commission, including the established places and methods that the public may secure information or make requests;

"(B) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined; and

"(C) rules adopted as authorized by law.

"(2) NONPUBLICATION.—No individual may be subject to rules, organizations, or procedures not published as required under paragraph (1).

"SEC. 6. COMMISSION HEARINGS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, a subcommittee of two or more members of the Commission with representation from both political parties, may hold such hearings and act at such times and places as the Commission or such authorized subcommittee consider necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Commission.

"(b) DECISION TO HOLD HEARING.—The decision to hold a hearing by the Commission, or the appointment of a subcommittee to hold hearings, shall be approved by a majority of the Commission, or by a majority of the members of the Commission present at a meeting at which at least a quorum of four members is present.

"(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days prior to the commencement of any hearing, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the date on which such hearing is to commence, the place at which such hearing is to be held, and the subject of such hearing.

"(d) OPENING STATEMENT.—The Chair of the Commission, or an individual designated by the Chair to act as the Chair at a hearing of the Commission, shall announce the subject of a hearing in the opening statement of such hearing.

"(e) COPY OF RULES.—A copy of the rules of the Commission shall be made available to any witness appearing before the Commission. A witness compelled by a subpoena to appear before the Commission, or required to produce written or other matter for the Commission, shall be served with a copy of the rules of the Commission at the time of service of such subpoena.

"(f) RIGHT OF COUNSEL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual who is compelled to appear before the Commission

shall have the right to be accompanied and advised by counsel.

"(2) RIGHT OF COUNSEL.—An attorney who represents an individual appearing before the Commission shall have the right to subject the client of such attorney to reasonable examination, to make objections on the record, and to argue briefly concerning the basis for such objections.

"(g) RIGHT TO A SPEEDY HEARING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall proceed with reasonable speed to conclude any hearing that the Commission is conducting.

"(2) CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY OF WITNESSES.—The Commission shall act with due regard for the convenience and necessity of witnesses to a hearing.

"(h) CENSURE AND EXCLUSION.—The Chair of the Commission or the individual designated by the Chair to act as Chair at a hearing, may punish breaches of order and decorum by censure and exclusion from the hearings.

"(i) DEFAMATION, DEGRADATION, OR INCRIMINATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any individual, the Commission shall receive such evidence, testimony, or summary of such evidence or testimony in executive session.

"(2) OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR.—The Commission shall allow an individual who is defamed, degraded, or incriminated by evidence or testimony referred to in paragraph (1) an opportunity to appear and be heard in executive session, with a reasonable number of additional witnesses requested by such individual, before deciding to use such evidence or testimony.

"(3) PUBLIC SESSION.—If the Commission determines to release or use such evidence or testimony referred to in paragraph (1) in a manner that publicly reveals the identity of the individual who was defamed, degraded, or incriminated, such evidence or testimony, prior to such public release or use, shall be provided at a public session, and the Commission shall afford such individual the opportunity to—

"(A) appear as a voluntary witness;

"(B) file a sworn statement on behalf of such individual; and

"(C) submit brief and pertinent sworn statements of other individuals.

"(4) ADDITIONAL WITNESSES.—The Commission shall receive and dispose of requests from an individual described in paragraph (3) to subpoena additional witnesses in accordance with paragraph (3)(C).

"(5) REPORT.—If a report of the Commission tends to defame, degrade or incriminate any individual, such report shall be delivered to such individual not later than 30 days prior to such report being made public in order to allow such individual the opportunity to make a timely answer to the report.

"(6) VERIFIED ANSWER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Each individual defamed, degraded, or incriminated in the report referred to in paragraph (5) may file a verified answer to the report with the Commission not later than 20 days after service of the report on such individual.

"(B) EXTENSION.—On a showing of good cause, the Commission may grant such individual an extension of time to file such answer.

"(C) SUBSTANCE OF ANSWER.—Such answer shall plainly and concisely state the facts and law constituting the reply or defense of

such individual to the charges or allegations contained in a report referred to in paragraph (5).

"(D) APPENDIX TO THE REPORT.—Such answer shall be published as an appendix to such report.

"(E) AMENDMENT OF THE ANSWER.—The right to answer within the appropriate time limitations, permitted under subparagraph (A), and to have such answer annexed to such report, shall be limited only by the power of the Commission to amend such answer to exclude matter that the Commission determines has been inserted in such answer scandalously, prejudicially, or unnecessarily.

"(J) RELEASE OF EVIDENCE OR TESTIMONY.—No evidence, testimony, or summary of such evidence or testimony, taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission.

"(K) SWORN STATEMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the discretion of the Commission, witnesses in a hearing may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record of such hearing.

"(2) RELEVANCE.—The Commission shall determine the relevance of the testimony and evidence described in paragraph (1) at a hearing.

"(1) COPY OR TRANSCRIPT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An accurate transcript shall be made of the testimony of all witnesses at all hearings, including both public or executive sessions, of the Commission or of any subcommittee of the Commission.

"(2) RIGHT TO TRANSCRIPT.—An individual who submits data or evidence shall be entitled to inspect or, on payment of lawfully prescribed costs, procure a copy or transcript of such data or evidence.

"(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply to a witness in a hearing held in executive session. Such witness shall be allowed to inspect the official transcript of the testimony of such witness.

"(4) OBTAINING COPIES OF TRANSCRIPT.—A copy of the transcript for a public session of a hearing may be obtained by a member of the general public on the payment of the cost of such copy.

"(m) PAYMENT OF WITNESSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A witness attending any hearing of the Commission shall be paid the same fees and mileage costs as witnesses in the courts of the United States.

"(2) MILEAGE PAYMENTS.—Mileage payments shall be tendered to a witness under paragraph (1) on service of a subpoena issued on behalf of the Commission or any subcommittee of the Commission.

"(n) SUBPOENA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena for the attendance and testimony of a witness or the production of written or other matter for the Commission may be—

"(A) issued in accordance with subsection (m) and paragraph (2) of this subsection, with the signature of the Chair of the Commission or of the appropriate subcommittee; and

"(B) served by any individual designated by the Chair.

"(2) SUBPOENA AUTHORITY OUTSIDE OF JURISDICTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may not issue any subpoena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses, or for the production of written or other matter, that would require the presence of the witness subpoenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State where such witness is found, re-

sides, is domiciled, transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if the attendance and testimony of a witness or the production of written or other matter is subpoenaed at a hearing that is held within 50 miles of the place where such witness is found, resides, is domiciled, transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process.

"(3) FAILURE TO OBEY SUBPOENA.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If an individual refuses to obey a subpoena, a district court of the United States, a United States court of any territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of the hearing for which the Commission subpoenaed such individual or that such individual is found, resides, is domiciled, transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, shall, on application by the Attorney General of the United States, have jurisdiction to order such individual to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee of the Commission in order to produce pertinent, relevant, and nonprivileged evidence as ordered by the Commission, or to give testimony concerning the matter under investigation by the Commission.

"(B) CONTEMPT.—A failure to obey an order of a court issued under subparagraph (A) may be punished by such court as contempt.

"(4) REQUESTS TO SUBPOENA ADDITIONAL WITNESSES.—The Chair of the Commission shall receive and dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

"(o) ADMINISTERING OATHS AND TAKING STATEMENTS.—Each member of the Commission shall have the power and authority to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation during a hearing of the Commission.

"(p) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION.—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code, relating to administrative procedure and freedom of information, shall, to the extent not inconsistent with this section, apply to the Commission.

"SEC. 7. FEDERAL AGENCIES.

"Each Federal agency shall cooperate fully with the Commission to enable the Commission to carry out effectively the functions and duties of the Commission.

"SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act."

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendment made by this Act shall become effective on January 1, 1990.●

By Mr. BOSCHWITZ (for himself, Mr. BOND, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GORTON, Mr. COATS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GARN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr.

DECONCINI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SASSER, Mr. GORE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. GLENN):

S.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution to designate October 22 through October 29, 1989, as "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug-Free America"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL RED RIBBON WEEK FOR A DRUG FREE AMERICA

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President. I rise today with my colleagues Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BOND, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GORTON, Mr. COATS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GARN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SASSER, Mr. GORE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. NUNN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. PELL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. GLENN to introduce a resolution declaring October 22 through October 29, 1989, as "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug-Free America".

Mr. President, drug and alcohol abuse in the United States has reached epidemic proportions and many Americans are deeply concerned. And they have a right to be. The facts are frightening.

Twenty-three million Americans age 12 and over currently use illicit drugs.

A nationwide Weekly Reader survey revealed that of the 68,000 fourth-graders polled, 34 percent reported peer pressure to try wine coolers, 41 percent to smoke, and 24 percent to use crack or cocaine.

The 15- to 24-year-old age group is dying at a faster rate than any other age group because of accidents, homicides, and suicides, much of which is related to drug and alcohol abuse.

Together with the National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth and the Honorary Chairperson President and Mrs. Bush, "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug-Free America" is a comprehensive public awareness and prevention education program involving thousands of parent and community groups from across the country. The National Federation of Parents for Drug-Free Youth has organizations in every State promoting healthy drug-free lives, and I believe it's important that the U.S.

Senate show our support for what this fine organization is doing for this country.

You're probably wondering, where does the red ribbon fit into all this about drugs and alcohol? It's simple. Every American is encouraged to wear or display red ribbons during "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug-Free America" to present a visible commitment to a healthy, drug-free life style, and to develop an attitude of intolerance to the use of drugs.

Mr. President, my resolution is the Senate companion to House Resolution 373. Today I urge my colleagues to join me in designating October 22 to 29 as "National Red Ribbon Week for a Drug-Free America."●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 355

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 355, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend through 1992 the period during which qualified mortgage bonds and mortgage credit certificates may be issued.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 720, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the targeted jobs credit and for other purposes.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] were added as cosponsors of S. 849, a bill to repeal section 2036(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, relating to valuation freezes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to provide grants for designating rural hospitals as medical assistance facilities.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the effectiveness of the low-income housing credit.

S. 1165

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DeCONCINI], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1165, a bill to provide for fair employment practices in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

S. 1207

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1207, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reform the radio broadcast license renewal process and for other purposes.

S. 1629

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1629, a bill to establish clearly a Federal right of action by aliens and U.S. citizens against persons engaging in torture or extrajudicial killings, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 160

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 160, a joint resolution to designate December 7, 1989, as "National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day" on the occasion of the anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 164

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 164, a joint resolution designating 1990 as the "International Year of Bible Reading."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 173

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 173, a joint resolution to designate the decade beginning January 1, 1990, as the "Decade of the Brain."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 186

At the request of Mr. McCLURE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 186, a joint resolution designating the week of March 1 through March 7, 1990 as "National Quarter Horse Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 194

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Idaho

[Mr. McCLURE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 194, a joint resolution designating November 12 to 18, 1989 as "National Glaucoma Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 196

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 196, a joint resolution to establish the month of October 1989, as "Country Music Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 212

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 212, a joint resolution designating April 24, 1989, as "National Day of Remembrance of the 75th Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-23."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IMPLEMENTATION OF PRESIDENT'S DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 910

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. DOLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1711) to implement the President's 1989 National Drug Control Strategy, as follows:

Add at the end thereof the following:

"(d) In issuing regulations pursuant to subsection (b) of this Act, the Attorney General shall also take into account the ability to pay for drug testing programs to be undertaken by the State and local governments."

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the amendment I am filing today, to S. 1711, will clearly provide that the attorney general must take into account a State of local government's ability to pay for drug testing when promulgating regulations under the bill.

While we have been given guarantees by the administration that it will not impose costly requirements on the State local governments which will be required to test some of those arrested, incarcerated, or on probation or parole, concerns continue that the cost to these governments could be excessive.

This amendment will put an end to those concerns once and for all. It does nothing more than is being sought by the administration, and will allow the

debate to be focused on the essential need to drug test at least a portion of these individuals.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a field hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests on S. 1343, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1989.

The hearing will take place on Saturday, October 28, 1989, beginning at 10 a.m. and concluding at approximately 4 p.m., with a break from 12 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. The hearing will be held at the Denver City Council Chambers, in the City-County Building, 1435 Bancroft Street, Denver.

Witnesses invited by the subcommittee representing a cross-section of views and organizations will testify during the morning session. Others wishing to testify may, as time permits, make a brief statement of no more than 2 minutes. Those wishing to testify should contact Senator TIM WIRTH's office in Denver at (303) 866-1900. The deadline for signing up to testify is Friday, October 20.

The subcommittee will attempt to accommodate as many persons desiring to testify as time permits, while providing that all views on the bill have an opportunity to be heard.

Witnesses are requested to bring 10 copies of their testimony with them to the hearing, and not to submit any testimony in advance. Statements may also be submitted for the hearing record. It is only necessary to provide one copy of any material submitted for the record. Comments for the record may be brought to the hearing or submitted to the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20008.

For further information, please contact David Brooks of the subcommittee staff in Washington at (202) 224-9863 or Jim Martin in Senator WIRTH's Denver office at (303) 866-1900.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 2, 1989, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on death penalty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 2, at 10 a.m., to hear witnesses on United States policy toward Indochina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full committee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate October 2, 1989, 9:30 a.m. for a hearing to receive testimony on the Department of Energy's efforts to improve the operations and management of its atomic energy defense activities and its efforts to restore public credibility in the Department's ability to operate its facilities in a safe and environmentally sound manner; and on S. 972, S. 1304, and any other legislation pending before the committee related to the environment, safety, and health aspects of operation of the Department's nuclear facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, NATIONAL PARKS AND FORESTS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate October 2, 1989, 2 p.m. for a hearing to receive testimony on S. 11, a bill to provide for the protection of the public lands in the California desert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 2, at 2 p.m., to hold hearings on the following ambassadorial nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

"PARENT POWER" IN EDUCATION

● Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, recently the national spotlight has focused on one of America's top priorities—education. President Bush convened his education summit with the Nation's Governors. The last time we had such a summit was in 1933, when

President Franklin Roosevelt called all the Governors together to discuss his plans for dealing with the Great Depression.

Earlier this month, leaders in the Democratic Party announced national goals for educational excellence. Hopefully, these events will prove to be significant steps in improving America's schools and the performance of our students.

Six years ago this Nation was rocked by the watershed report issued by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk." In the past, the report stated:

Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy, and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents.

The figures were staggering. One million teenagers in this country cannot read above the third grade level. One-fourth of our Nation's youth never graduate from high school. One-third of all adults are to some degree illiterate.

Education is critically important. It determines our children's future—and it determines the future of this country. According to Ben Franklin, education is just about the best investment there is. "If a man empties his purse into his head," Franklin said, "no man can take it away from him. An investment in knowledge always pays the best interest."

Following the 1983 landmark report, we saw a nationwide effort to improve education. Course requirements were stiffened. Teachers' salaries were raised. And new standards were put in place in most of America's 50 States. Progress was made. Unfortunately, there is evidence that the reform movement has run out of steam.

A National Geographic study released last year found that 75 percent of the young Americans surveyed could not locate the Persian Gulf on a map. One out of seven could not identify the United States on a world map.

A 1987 study of 17-year-olds by the National Endowment for the Humanities found startling gaps in their knowledge of history and literature. Over two-thirds could not place the Civil War within the correct half century. Nearly a third placed Columbus' discovery of America after 1750.

Then there was the 1988 study by the Educational Testing Service comparing the performance of U.S. students in science and math with that of students from 11 other countries and Canadian provinces. The result? In international math and science tests, the United States comes out rock bottom.

These results are simply not acceptable. They underscore the need for a new national effort to reverse the de-

cline in America's system of education. This need has resulted in the first U.S. summit in 56 years and the Democrats' announcement of national educational goals.

The recommendations we are hearing all stress the responsibility of educators and Government to tackle the education crisis. There is an emphasis on accountability—on holding teachers, students, and schools to standards of quality in education.

But educators do not have all of the answers, and neither does Government. Parents also have a role—a very important role—in their children's education. Significantly, "A Nation at Risk" concludes with recommendations to parents on specific ways they can ensure their children's success in school. It ends with the message to parents that "your child's ideas about education and its significance begin with you."

Two educators from Pinal County, AZ—Sherry Ferguson and Lawrence Mazin—have written a book on the importance of the parent's role in education. "Parent Power: A Guide to Your Child's Success in School" is predicated on the belief that "parents are the first and most important of their children's educators." If American education is to survive, it states, there must be cooperation among school, community, and most important—family.

"Parent Power" encourages parents to get actively involved in their children's education. The book contains checklists with questions for parents to ask themselves: Do you enhance your home environment to support learning? If your child cannot explain or understand the homework, do you find out why? Does your family make a commitment to limit all TV watching by everyone? The book cites a shocking study by Michigan State University. That study gave 4- and 5-year-olds a hypothetical choice between giving up television or their fathers. One third chose to keep the TV.

"Parent Power" also encourages parents to shape their child's values and to show caring and compassion, especially when the child fails at a task. It encourages parents to spend time together as a family. Above all, it encourages parents to build their child's self-image, and quotes nationally acclaimed teacher Marva Collins: "What a person thinks of himself will determine his destiny."

In America today one out of every four students will drop out of school. As "Parent Power" suggests, the difference between these students and those who stay in school may very well be a parent who gives encouragement, love, and support. ●

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING CHIEF OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, ADM. WILLIAM J. CROWE, JR.

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, on Friday my good friend and fellow Oklahoman Adm. William Crowe retired as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has earned the respect and appreciation of all Americans and has brought special pride to all of us in his home State. We all feel a sense of loss in his retirement as we have welcomed the opportunity to work regularly with such an experienced and qualified officer. However, I hope to continue to consult with Admiral Crowe as an expert on military and foreign affairs. His insights will always be valuable in such matters due to his proven reputation as a capable decisionmaker. He will undoubtedly remain an important, unofficial adviser to many Members of Congress and government officials.

During his tenure as the chief officer in the military, William Crowe has set a standard by which all future chairmen will be measured. His expertise on the relationships between the Congress, the White House and the military is unsurpassed by any other Chairman. The Chairman has understood the need to harmonize military capabilities with the ever changing political atmosphere. Thanks to Admiral Crowe, we have a model for the skills needed by the military officers of the 1990's and beyond.

No recent American military leader has done more to pool the resources of the military services for maximum efficiency in several ways including giving real support from the Joint Chiefs to unified commands. His insights on many matters faced by the Intelligence Committee have been of tremendous help. He understands the use of intelligence as a force multiplier in times of tight military budgets. He was the first Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to take a trip inside the Soviet Union. He was also a force in the advancement of arms negotiations because he was able to form a personal relationship with the leader of the Soviet military. Admiral Crowe has as clear an understanding as any American of the likely evolution of our relationship with that military superpower in the future.

Crowe has a broad background, strong in both the civilian and military areas. After he graduated from the Naval Academy, he did not ascend the ladder of naval hierarchy in orthodox succession. Instead of taking the route to leadership positions, he took the academic-political route. In 1956 he took a year to earn his masters of arts in education from Stanford University. He received his doctorate in politics from Princeton in 1965. He then ascended to admiral through a series of challenging assignments in-

cluded serving as head of Naval Office of Plans and Policy, Commander of the Allied Forces Southern Europe and Commander of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific. While at each of these positions he established himself as a capable leader and skilled diplomat. In many of the areas he formed relationships that would benefit him throughout his career.

Admiral Crowe has become a symbol of the modern military and its evolving role in today's society. He is just as at home attending a Washington political gathering as when he is skipping a Navy submarine. The diversity of his knowledge and his resourcefulness have allowed him to make a great contribution to our national security effort.

Crowe is not only a qualified leader, but he is a fine human being who values the constant struggle for the advancement of mankind. Let me share a few examples of his dedication. For the past 4 years he has served as an active member of the selection committee for the Oklahoma Foundation for Excellence, which is a program in Oklahoma that picks the top 100 high school scholars and the top 4 teachers to be honored as Academic All-Staters. Crowe's membership on the committee is not just an honorary position; he has spent hours pouring over academic records in order to evaluate which Oklahoma students and teachers deserve to be picked as "cream of the crop."

One of my favorite stories about Admiral Crowe and his caring personality occurred last Christmas. A young Oklahoman named Jason Brady who was afflicted with a rare form of cancer and had been diagnosed to live only a few more weeks was given a trip to Washington. The trip was provided by a nonprofit organization which tries to fulfill one special wish of terminally ill children. Even with his busy schedule Crowe put everything on hold to spend time with young Jason. The Admiral even showed Jason his world famous hat collection, souvenirs of his life's travels and experiences. Bill Crowe's sincere concern for others, his kindness and thoughtfulness have made him a leader that others want to follow.

While all of us are sorry to see Admiral Crowe retire, for Oklahomans at least, there is a silver lining. He will soon become a distinguished visiting professor at the University of Oklahoma. Young Oklahomans will have the chance to learn from him as he shares his experience and expertise with them. It is typical of Bill Crowe as it is of his fine wife, Shirley, who has been a true partner in public service, that he wanted to give back to his home State and to the next generation in such a special way.

To Adm. Bill Crowe, and to Mrs. Shirley Crowe, we all say thank you

for your service to our country. We salute you.●

THOMAS MEREDITH, PRESIDENT OF WESTERN KENTUCKY UNI- VERSITY

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to insert into the RECORD a copy of an article that appeared in Monday's Louisville Courier-Journal about Mr. Thomas Meredith, the president of Western Kentucky University. Mr. Meredith's first year as president has been filled with engagements that have not only boosted the image of Western Kentucky University, but also the image of himself as an advocate for an improved educational system for the State of Kentucky.

Mr. Meredith, "has come home to make a difference." This native of Owensboro served as a vice chancellor at the University of Mississippi during his 19-year stay in Mississippi. Meredith is not only determined to improve his university, Western Kentucky University, but he plans to help in the long process of developing a new Kentucky educational system.

Mr. Meredith can only prove to be a great asset to the State of Kentucky. He is a man truly dedicated to education and the overall betterment of Kentucky's people. I hope, Mr. President, that you and my fellow colleagues will take the time to note the outstanding achievements of my constituent.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Sept. 25, 1989]

MEREDITH'S FIRST YEAR IN REVIEW: WKU PRESIDENT WANTS SCHOOL AT FOREFRONT OF EDUCATION

(By Cynthia Crossley)

BOWLING GREEN, KY.—In his first year as Western Kentucky University's president, Thomas Meredith worked on cultivating an image.

Two images, in fact—his own and the university's.

The more than 100 civic groups, high school students and alumni groups who Meredith visited in the past year heard about Western's accomplishments and how he wants to put the school on the cutting edge of education.

If he touched at all on conflicts within the university, it was to say he was studying the issues and using his first year to observe things.

Meredith, an Owensboro native who spent 19 years in Mississippi, including a stint as a vice chancellor at the University of Mississippi, also has been saying that he came to Western "to make a difference."

"I didn't come back just to sit in the president's chair," Meredith said recently. "This state can't be all I want it to be until we have a first-rate education system."

Meredith formally took over as president Sept. 15, 1988. He succeeded Kern Alexander, who had become embroiled in several controversies during his 2½ years as president, including an attempt to reorganize student publications that was denounced by many as censorship and plans—eventually

dropped—to buy and move the birthplace of poet Robert Penn Warren from Guthrie, Ky., to the Western campus.

Since taking over, Meredith has devoted much of his time to giving speeches and boosting Western's image, but he has carried out a few initiatives too. He streamlined transfers for community-college students interested in four-year degrees, and he's planning to appoint a committee soon to study what Western's priorities should be in the next 10 years. He's also proposed the creation of two development centers, to serve the state's teachers and businesses.

He's also increased Western's efforts to attract and retain minority professors and minority students and to attract more top students in general.

While education leaders praised those efforts—particularly the new transfer process—it has been Meredith's talks around the state that have won him rave reviews.

"I think he's wonderful," said Mike Harrel, a Louisville banker who is chairman of the state Council on Higher Education and a former Western regent. "He brings very strong communication skills and a sense of focus and vision."

"I think he's a forceful and persuasive advocate for Western Kentucky University," said University of Louisville President Donald Swain.

But some people at Western—specifically members of the faculty senate—think Meredith has indeed done little more than sit in the president's chair when he is in town. They point to several things they think he should have acted on in the past year.

"He's been a good (Western) president for the rest of the state, but he's not followed up on resolutions from the faculty senate," said senate President Bart White, an associate professor of communications and broadcasting. "We didn't hire him to be public relations chairman; we hired him to be a president. You can't be head of an organization and not listen to the people within it."

Meredith says he is listening to his faculty but that his first year in office has been an unusual one because he was away so much introducing himself.

Meredith also said some people want him to act faster—to react, instead of studying their requests.

"Some administrators like to react as soon as a little smoke appears," Meredith said. "I typically like to massage things a little bit (and) make sure we understand the situation, to make sure we have all the sides of an issue."

Last week he began responding to some of the faculty's requests. He plans to decide in the next week or so on whether Western will have department heads or department chairs, and what responsibilities the title will bring. Western now has department heads; professors say department chairs would better represent their needs. The faculty senate asked him for a decision on the matter a year ago.

Meredith also said last week that he will probably appoint a committee to study a faculty report on athletic spending, although he declined to set a timetable. The report, released in March, found that Western's athletic spending has risen 141 percent in 10 years, creating a deficit that had grown to \$1.5 million in 1987-88, and it suggested that Western cut back its athletic spending.

The three Western professors who wrote the report recommended that Meredith appoint an objective committee of representatives from Western's athletic programs, the

faculty and the surrounding community to study athletic spending at Western, said Arvin Vos, a professor of philosophy and religion and one of the report's authors.

In August, when Meredith had not taken any noticeable action on the report, the professors submitted an essay based on the report to editorial pages around the state. It appeared in several newspapers, including the Courier-Journal.

Not all faculty members, however, agree with the report. Some older professors recall a similar controversy about athletics in the early 1980s and said the latest report had overlooked many ways athletics serve the university.

Last week, a rebuttal to the essay by a trio of Western economics professors was published in the Courier-Journal; it said the three professors who wrote the report had used inflated cost figures and had overlooked some indirect revenues in reaching their conclusions.

And Meredith, who attended college on a basketball scholarship, said he had heard nothing but "100 percent support" for Western's athletic programs from the surrounding community.

The athletic-spending report is probably the university's most divisive issue, but professors and administrators interviewed for this story agreed that the report—and Meredith—may be the focal point for long-term frustrations over historically low funding for higher education in Kentucky.

Like other schools, Western is facing several problems stemming from a lack of money.

A 30 percent increase in enrollment over the past four years is straining Western's faculty and buildings. In an interview, Meredith said this fall's preliminary enrollment of 14,694 may mark the limit to which the university can expand without significant funding increases.

That means Western may have to set earlier application deadlines or demand higher high school grades and admission-test scores, Meredith said.

"We don't want to cap enrollment in a state where one out of every nine residents is a college graduate," Meredith said. "We should be trying to educate everyone we can. I don't know of a state that has developed economically, as we want to, that hasn't first improved its education system."

In addition, Western has had to defer building repairs.

For example, faculty members talked about pianos and books ruined by moisture, of bricks falling off buildings, of floors separating from walls.

Low faculty salaries are also a problem. Some observers say the salaries are driving away the next generation of talented professors, as well as making current teachers less inclined to go the extra step.

Surveys have shown that Kentucky's professors are earning an average of \$5,455 less per year than their counterparts across the nation and nearly \$3,000 less than colleagues within the region.

Meredith's answer is to ask the state for more money and to improve Western's ability to raise money from private sources. Some of his talks last year set the stage to do just that, he said.

Western's board of regents resolved in July to ask next year's legislature for an extra \$3.9 million to raise faculty and staff salaries, and an extra \$2.83 million to add instructional staff to handle the additional enrollment. It also wants \$43.4 million for building improvements—and that doesn't in-

clude money needed for a new residence hall and a new classroom building.

Funding for higher education will be running up against proposals to revise spending on Kentucky's elementary and secondary schools. While Meredith argues that the state should look at the total educational picture—kindergarten through college—the Kentucky Supreme Court ruling earlier this year ordering the revamping of the public-education system covers only kindergarten through 12th grade. So far most of the public discussion on the issue has left out higher education.

The faculty senate doubts the state will give Western more money. Western is getting only 84 percent of the money that the state's funding formula says it should get, university officials said. The faculty believes Western's only recourse is to reallocate its budget, including changing its spending on athletics.

Meredith may be more successful in raising private money. While he was a top administrator at the University of Mississippi, the school raised \$61 million in private funds.

"I think he would be very successful. He has a natural ability to be a fund-raiser and to sell his agenda," said Owensboro Mayor David Adkisson, who's also chairman of Kentucky Advocates for Higher Education. "He's very articulate and presents a great case." ●

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 218, H.R. 838, a bill authorizing the release of airport restrictions in Newport News, VA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 838) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the Peninsula Airport Commission for airport purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment.

On page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

Sec. 2. Section 511(a)(12) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 App. U.S.C. 2210(a)(12)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "and except further that this limitation on the use of all other revenues generated by the airport shall not apply to revenues generated from a contract between the State of Hawaii and a commercial licensee permitting the display and sale of in-bond merchandise at a location both on and off airport properties within that State, and revenues so generated may be expended for any transportation purpose, including, but not limited to, airports, harbors, and highways of that State only if (A) the revenues which may be so

used are limited to revenues attributable to sales of in-bond merchandise from other than airport properties; (B) the revenues which may be so used are in excess of 150 percent of the requirements of the airport revenue fund for a period of 12 months following the State's annual estimate of the airport's requirements; and (C) the revenues described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph are not available for transportation expenses other than those related to air transportation after December 31, 1995."

So as to make the bill read:

H.R. 838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the Peninsula Airport Commission, Virginia, for airport purposes", approved November 6, 1986 (Public Law 99-618; 100 Stat. 3490), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking "7.5 acres" and inserting "20.5 acres"; and
(2) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 2. Section 511(a)(12) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 App. U.S.C. 2210(a)(12)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "and except further that this limitation on the use of all other revenues generated by the airport shall not apply to revenues generated from a contract between the State of Hawaii and a commercial licensee permitting the display and sale of in-bond merchandise at a location both on and off airport properties within that State, and revenues so generated may be expended for any transportation purpose, including, but not limited to, airports, harbors, and highways of that State only if (A) the revenues which may be so used are limited to revenues attributable to sales of in-bond merchandise from other than airport properties; (B) the revenues which may be so used are in excess of 150 percent of the requirements of the airport revenue fund for a period of 12 months following the State's annual estimate of the airport's requirements; and (C) the revenues described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph are not available for transportation expenses other than those related to air transportation after December 31, 1995;"

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate, H.R. 838, legislation critical to the advancement of aviation and transportation in the States of Virginia and Hawaii. It is a bill that was unanimously approved by the Commerce Committee before the August recess, and I hope that it will be approved by the Senate today.

Very simply, the bill attempts to address longstanding issues affecting two airports. First, at Newport News, VA, legislation is needed to allow the limited release of deed restrictions on property originally conveyed to the Peninsula Airport Commission, which operates the Patrick Henry Airport. Legislation similar to this was enacted during the 99th Congress, but Public Law 99-618 did not allow for the release of the 13 acres specified by this bill, or the transfer of land to private entities.

The Federal Aviation Administration has stated that it has no objection to this provision, as the property involved will not affect the operation or development of the airport in Newport News. Additionally, attorneys for the Peninsula Airport Commission have provided their assurances that the proceeds from the sale of this land have been used for the development, improvement, operation, and maintenance of the airport.

Mr. President, H.R. 838 will also address a situation in the State of Hawaii to ensure the efficient use of funds generated at the off-airport duty-free facility in Honolulu for aviation and other transportation needs.

The State of Hawaii has estimated that the combined operation of the on-airport and off-airport duty-free facilities will generate \$1.15 billion over a 5-year period. Given the funding needs for Hawaii's system of airports, the revenues derived from the off-airport facility are therefore expected to create a substantial surplus in the State's airport revenue fund. However, under current law, funds derived from such an off-airport duty-free facility must be dedicated solely to air transportation development and operations.

This legislation would resolve this situation by permitting the use of certain revenues generated by the off-airport duty-free facility in Hawaii for any transportation purpose, such as airport development, highway construction, and harbor development. To protect funding for the Honolulu International Airport, as well as the other airports in Hawaii, the bill provides that only those revenues in excess of 150 percent of their funding requirements be transferred for other transportation purposes. Additionally, this provision, which is limited to this single facility in the State of Hawaii, is designed to sunset at the end of 1995, a further safeguard that will ensure adequate review in the future.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill is a balanced effort to resolve two problems very unique to two airports. I urge its passage today and hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there amendments to the committee substitute?

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time,

the question is on the passage of the bill.

So the bill (H.R. 838) was passed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

URGING THE AWARD OF A NOBEL PRIZE FOR PRESERVATION OF THE WORLD ENVIRONMENT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 252, Senate Joint Resolution 162, a joint resolution urging the Nobel Commission to consider awarding a prize for achievements in preserving the world environment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 162) to urge the Nobel Commission to consider awarding Nobel Prize recognition for achievements in preservation of the world environment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read the third time and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 162) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S.J. Res. 162

Whereas the world's environmental problems are no longer confined within the borders of a single nation, but affect the citizens of all nations;

Whereas the world must act in the next decade to ward off a grave and growing danger to the global ecological system that sustains life as we know it;

Whereas the science of global environmental studies is expanding dramatically both in academic stature and in political importance;

Whereas the findings of environmental scientists in areas such as stratospheric ozone depletion, the greenhouse effect, deforestation, and acid rain are already leading to a profound change in public con-

sciousness and in the agendas of all governments;

Whereas the work of these outstanding individuals should be recognized on a global scale, not only to reward their accomplishments, but to increase worldwide awareness of the environmental peril and underscore the urgency of environmental protection; and

Whereas humankind's pursuit of progress in the sciences, literature, economics, and world peace will falter if we do not also work to save the planet on which we live: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States urges the Nobel Commission to consider awarding Nobel Prize recognition for achievements in preservation of the world environment. Such a prize would recognize outstanding individuals who have made signal contributions to our awareness of and responsibility for the environment.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELIMINATION OF PREVENTABLE DEATHS AND DISABLING ILLNESS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 253, Senate Resolution 122, expressing the sense of the Senate in support of actions to eliminate preventable deaths and disabling illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 122) expressing the sense of the Senate in support of actions to eliminate preventable deaths and disabling illness, especially among children, through intensified international collaboration to attain the United Nations goals of Universal Childhood Immunization by 1990 and Health for All by the Year 2000, and through the convening of a World Summit on Children.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, and the preamble, are as follows:

S. RES. 122

Whereas in 1982 the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) launched the "Child Survival and Development Revolution", to reduce by one-half by the end of this century the then daily toll of 45,000 deaths of young children attributable to preventable disease and malnutrition;

Whereas such "Child Survival and Development Revolution" has achieved impressive results, despite the extreme economic

and developmental difficulties that have afflicted developing countries in this decade;

Whereas in 1983 Congress approved a joint resolution (Public Law 98-198) that was the first piece of national legislation to endorse formally the Child Survival and Development Revolution;

Whereas low-cost, high-impact, health and nutrition interventions form the core of child survival programs;

Whereas most notably, oral rehydration therapy and immunization are already by 1989 saving the lives of over 2,500,000 children per year who would have died if the death rates of 1982 still prevailed;

Whereas UNICEF, the World Health Organization (WHO), the governments of developing countries, the World Bank, and other multilateral and bilateral development assistance agencies (including the Agency for International Development in the United States) have identified additional low-cost opportunities for dramatically improving the survival, health, and development of the children of the world;

Whereas such low-cost opportunities could, with increased international coordination, political commitment, and institutional innovation, increase the number of children saved to over 5,000,000 within 2 years and to over 10,000,000 annually on a permanent and sustainable basis by 2000;

Whereas fewer than 5 percent of children in the developing world were immunized against the six major childhood diseases when the United Nations' goal of "Universal Child Immunization of 1990" was initiated in 1977;

Whereas now more than 50 percent of children worldwide are immunized and the Universal Child Immunization target of at least 80 percent immunization by 1990 is within reach for a majority of developing countries;

Whereas the Child Survival and Development Revolution requires integrated action to meet the goals of providing the following basic needs: nutrition, primary health care, environmental sanitation, water, and basic shelter, and basic education, especially for women and girls;

Whereas many governments, including the United States Government, have endorsed the attainment of these goals by the year 2000 as part of the WHO program of "Health for All";

Whereas a "Grand Alliance for Children" composed of a vast array of critically important private organizations, including voluntary associations, private businesses, the media, religious groups and other institutions, as well as governments, intergovernmental agencies and international organizations, is advancing child survival and development programs;

Whereas the emerging global concern for children, reflects a new international political commitment to future generations;

Whereas such political commitment has been evident at the highest levels of international discourse, such as the Joint State-Summit Meeting in Moscow between the United States and the Soviet Union;

Whereas at such Summit Meeting President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev reaffirmed support for the goal of UNICEF and WHO of reducing the sale of preventable childhood death and urged other countries and the international community to intensify efforts to achieve such goals;

Whereas a general surge in concern for the welfare of children has formed the

moral, legal, and political basis for the International Convention on the Rights of the Child;

Whereas such International Convention on the Rights of the Child would define the rights of children with regard to survival, protection, and development, and is expected to be approved by the United Nations Assembly in 1989;

Whereas Secretary of State James Baker has indicated that the United States should take a leadership role in the initiative to develop a plan to get to the core of the poverty problem in order to achieve a healthy world by 2000;

Whereas the United States has consistently led the world in the provision of financial, operational, research, and advocacy support for child survival initiatives; and

Whereas the Executive Director of UNICEF, with the current endorsement of over a score of national leaders from developed and developing countries, East and West, has proposed a "World Summit on Children" to promote international plans for achieving the goals of child survival, health, and development of all children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that the child survival and development programs implemented collaboratively by national governments, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Health Organization (WHO), the Agency for International Development, and many other governmental and nongovernmental organizations are to be commended and have the full support and encouragement of the Senate.

(2) the Senate reaffirms a commitment on the part of the Senate to the goal of permanent improvement in the survival rates, health, and development of people in all countries, especially children, by 2000, and urges the President to adopt such goals as a major priority of the executive branch and to lead the world community in proposing concrete actions to achieve such goal;

(3) the Senate urges the President, on behalf of the people and Government of the United States, to propose to the Secretary General of the United Nations that the Secretary General establish an independent advisory commission to provide strategic planning, leadership, and advice to the world community on collaborative actions and programs in primary health care, nutrition, basic education, and environment by all members of the Grand Alliance for Children in order to eliminate easily preventable death and disabling illness in all countries by 2000;

(4) the Senate endorses the call for a representative World Summit on Children at the earliest opportunity to provide a forum for governmental leaders, including the President of the United States, to commit to concrete plans of national action and international cooperation to reduce the scale of preventable childhood deaths nationally and globally;

(5) the Senate endorses, in particular, a commitment for such governmental leaders to attain the goals of Universal Childhood Immunization by 1990 and Health for All by 2000; and

(6) the Senate encourages the President of the United States to take a leading role in ensuring the convening of a World Summit on Children at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following calendar numbers en bloc, Calendar Nos. 266 through and including 276.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, the enumerated calendar orders will be considered en bloc.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committee amendments, where indicated, be agreed to; that Senators' statements may appear in the RECORD at the appropriate place as if read; that each bill be read for the third time; and the bills and resolutions be considered passed en bloc, and the preambles, where indicated, be agreed to; and the motion to reconsider the passage of bills and resolutions be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the several bills and resolutions will be considered en bloc, amendments where shown will be agreed to, statements by Senators will appear in the RECORD in accordance with the request; the various bills and resolutions will be moved to third reading, passed, and the motion to reconsider laid on the table.

POLICE FORCE OF THE NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

The bill (S. 1521) to amend Public Law 91-34 relating to the police force of the National Zoological Park of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S. 1521

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the text of section 5375 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall fix the per annum rates of basic pay of positions on the police force of the National Zoological Park in accordance with the following provisions:

"(1) PRIVATE—Not more than the rate for GS-7;

"(2) SERGEANT—Not more than the rate for GS-8;

"(3) LIEUTENANT—Not more than the rate for GS-9

"(4) CAPTAIN—Not more than the rate for GS-10;

APPOINTMENT OF SAMUEL C. JOHNSON AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 199) providing for the reappointment of Samuel C. Johnson as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S.J. RES. 199

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Samuel C. Johnson of Wisconsin on December 4, 1989, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for a term of six years, effective on the day after the current term expires.

APPOINTMENT OF JEANNINE SMITH CLARK AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 200) providing for the reappointment of Jeannine Smith Clark as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S.J. RES. 200

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Jeannine Smith Clark of the District of Columbia on August 25, 1989, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for a term of six years, effective on the day after the current term expires.

APPOINTMENT OF ROBERT JAMES WOOLSEY, JR., AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 202) provide for the appointment of Robert James Woolsey, Jr., of Maryland as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed; as follows:

S.J. RES. 202

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance

with Section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the death of Carlisle H. Humelsine of Virginia on January 26, 1989, be filled by the appointment of Robert James Woolsey, Jr. of Maryland for a term of six years, effective on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

APPOINTMENT OF HOMER ALFRED NEAL AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 203) providing for the appointment of Homer Alfred Neal of Michigan as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 203

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with Section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the resignation of Murray Gell-Mann of California on September 13, 1988, be filled by the appointment of Homer Alfred Neal of Michigan for a term of six years, effective on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

AUTHORIZING A CONCERT ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) authorizing a concert by the American Soviet Youth Orchestra on Capitol grounds, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the National Park Service shall be permitted to sponsor a concert by the American Soviet Youth Orchestra on the Capitol grounds on Tuesday, August 28, 1990, such concert to be free to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be provided by the Architect of the Capitol.

VOLUNTARY PROGRAM FOR RECYCLING OF PAPER USED IN THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 99) requiring the Architect of the Capitol to establish and implement a voluntary program for recycling paper used in the Senate, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 99

Resolved, That, not later than 6 months after this resolution is agreed to, the Architect of the Capitol shall establish and implement a voluntary program for recycling paper that is disposed of in the operation of

the Senate. Such program shall be designed to encourage separation of paper by type at the sources of generation (including offices of Members of the Senate) and to sell such paper for the purpose of recycling.

PRINTING OF REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF THE MAILING FRANK

The resolution (S. Res. 181) to authorize printing of the regulations governing the use of the mailing frank, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 181

Resolved, That, the regulations governing the use of the mailing frank by Members and officers of the United States Senate, together with related materials, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed two thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Select Committee on Ethics.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CIVIC ACHIEVEMENT AWARD PROGRAM IN HONOR OF THE OFFICE OF SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill (H.R. 2358) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1990 for the Civic Achievement Award Program in Honor of the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, was considered.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, the Civic Achievement Award Program in honor of the Office of Speaker of the House of Representatives [CAAP] was first authorized in 1987 in response to widespread recognition of the problem of civic illiteracy among our Nation's young people. It was developed and is administered by the Close Up Foundation, widely recognized for its innovative government studies programs, in conjunction with the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

The Civic Achievement Award Program [CAAP] targets the fifth through the eighth grade which experts view as a most critical stage in students' educational and social development. The program consists of three basic components: First, requiring students to master information about government, history, economics, geography, American culture, and current events; second, developing library research skills and helping students to enhance their critical thinking abilities; and third, volunteering service to the community and civic action. Following completion of the three projects, students, their teachers, and participating schools receive congressional award certificates in recognition of their accomplishments.

Mr. President, a report was recently released by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development after a 2-year study. It is interesting to note that

this study was initiated at the same time this program was implemented. The study cites ages 10 to 15 as a period of "extreme vulnerability," calling for an academic program that promotes critical reasoning, including service to the community—essentially an outline of the CAAP. After 2 years of experience with the Civic Achievement Award Program, it is heartening to know that the demand for CAAP has grown and that studies are now available which validate the need for a meaningful program.

The program was originally conceived as a congressional one, administered by the legislative branch and fully funded by Congress. The response has been so positive and the demand so great that it is now clear that budgetary constraints necessitate that the funding and administration be reconsidered. The legislation before us extends the program for 1 year and authorizes a very modest funding increase. While an increase from \$680,000 to \$1,033,785 is authorized, this program could grow from 25,000 students to 60,000 students if additional funds were available. The demand is such that next year's national launch could easily—and without solicitation—involve three or four times this number of participants.

During the next few months, the program likely will be moved from the jurisdiction of the Library of Congress, and the Close Up Foundation has been encouraged to engage in outside fundraising. Close Up has a long history of establishing effective public-private partnerships for its high school program. As public awareness of the need for such programs as CAAP grows, it is appropriate that private institutions become involved. Private dollars will enable us to significantly increase the outreach of this program and broaden substantially the reach of the Federal investment.

I wish to commend the Close Up Foundation and the National Association of Elementary School Principals for their work on this program. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The bill (H.R. 2358) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

AMENDING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The resolution (S. Res. 187) to amend rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate to correct the citation referring to title 39, United States Code, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 187

Resolved, That (a) Paragraph 1 of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "section 3210(a)(5)(D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3210(a)(6)(E)".

(b) Paragraph 3 of rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by strik-

ing out "section 3210(a)(5)(D)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3210(a)(6)(E)".

REVISION AND PRINTING OF THE SENATE MANUAL

The resolution (S. Res. 188) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 101st Congress, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 188

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration hereby is directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the One Hundred First Congress, that said manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that two thousand additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and one thousand copies shall be bound and delivered as may be directed by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 1711

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1711, introduced by Senator DOLE today, which seeks to implement the President's drug control strategy, be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M.; MORNING BUSINESS; CONSIDERATION OF S. 1711

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate complete its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 3, and that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business until 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none. That will be the order of the Senate.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m., the Senate begin consideration of S. 1711 introduced by Senator DOLE today, which implements the President's 1989 national drug control strategy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that is the order of the Senate.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, on tomorrow, Tuesday, October 3 at 12:15 p.m., the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the Eastern Airlines bill, the mandatory live quorum requirement being waived. Once that vote has been completed, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:15, and upon reconvening at 2:15, we will resume the debate on the

Zappala nomination in executive session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator submit this in the form of a request or is he restating the order as previously entered?

Mr. SARBANES. I am restating the order that was previously entered for the information of Senators as to what the order of business will be.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, if my good friend and very distinguished acting Republican leader has no further business, and if no Senator is seeking recognition, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I thank the acting leader and the Chair for their courtesies in concluding the day's activities.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, October 3, 1989, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1989:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

CLAIRE E. FREEMAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

EUGENE KISTLER LAWSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE FIRST VICE PRESIDENT OF THE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM OF 4 YEARS EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 1993.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

RICHARD SCHMALENSSEE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS.

THE ABOVE NOMINATIONS WERE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEES' COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive message received after the recess of the Senate on September 29, 1989, withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN RANDOLPH HUBBARD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO INDIA, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 3, 1989.